arXiv:1512.08551v1 [math.QA] 28 Dec 2015

KP HIERARCHY FOR THE CYCLIC QUIVER

OLEG CHALYKH AND ALEXEY SILANTYEV

Abstract. We introduce a generalisation of the KP hierarchy, closely related to the cyclic quiver and the Cherednik algebra $H_k(\mathbb{Z}_m)$. This hierarchy depends on m parameters (one of which can be eliminated), with the usual KP hierarchy corresponding to the $m = 1$ case. Generalising the result of G. Wilson [W1], we show that our hierarchy admits solutions parameterised by suitable quiver varieties. The pole dynamics for these solutions is shown to be governed by the classical Calogero–Moser system for the wreath-product $\mathbb{Z}_m \wr S_n$ and its new spin version. These results are further extended to the case of the multi-component hierarchy.

1. Introduction

It is a remarkable fact, first observed in [AMM], that integrable non-linear PDEs admit solutions whose poles move as classical-mechanical particles in a completely integrable fashion. One of the best-known examples is the KP hierarchy, in which case the classical integrable system in question is the Calogero–Moser system, see [Kr, CC]. Since the Calogero–Moser system can be generalised to all root systems and Coxeter groups [OP1, OP2], there is a natural question whether these generalisations can be similarly linked to integrable non-linear equations. For the infinite series of classical root systems a partial answer can be obtained by folding [OT, BST], which relates the Calogero–Moser systems in types A and B. However, what can be obtained in type B by folding constitutes only a very special case, while for the most general coupling parameters the answer, to the best of our knowledge, remained unknown. The present paper gives an answer to this question for all classical root systems and much more: as we will explain, there is a natural generalisation of the KP hierarchy that admits rational solutions whose pole dynamics is governed by the Calogero–Moser system for the complex reflection group $\mathbb{Z}_m \wr S_n$. The case $m = 1$ is the usual, type A Calogero–Moser problem, and the case $m = 2$ covers the remaining classical types.

Our approach to this problem is inspired by a result of G. Wilson, who has shown in [W1] that rational solutions of the KP hierarchy can be parametrised by (the points of) certain affine varieties, the Calogero–Moser spaces. The n-th Calogero–Moser space $\mathcal{C}_n$ can be viewed as a completed phase space of the n-particle Calogero–Moser system (hence their name). On the other hand, $\mathcal{C}_n$ is a particular example of a quiver variety, with the underlying quiver consisting of just one loop. From that perspective, the present work is a generalisation of that of Wilson, with the one-loop quiver replaced by the cyclic quiver on m vertices. It is worth mentioning that the spaces $\mathcal{C}_n$ have also appeared in the context of non-commutative projective geometry and classification of ideals of the first Weyl algebra [BW1, BW2, KKO]. The results of [BW1] prompted Crawley-Boevey and Holland to conjecture a similar link in the case of affine Dynkin quivers (see [CB1,

p. 45]). Their conjecture was later generalised and proved by Baranovsky, Ginzburg and Kuznetsov in [BGK1, BGK2]. In the case of the cyclic quiver this is related to the problem of classifying ideals of the Cherednik spherical subalgebra $\mathbf{e}H_k\mathbf{e}$ for the cyclic group. In [Esh] this problem was tackled differently to [BGK1, BGK2], by using the approach of [BC]. In fact, some of our formulas and calculations closely resemble those in [BC] and [Esh].

While the moduli spaces parametrising solutions to our hierarchy are known from the above works, the hierarchy itself seems new. We construct it in a Lax form in the same spirit as the usual KP hierarchy, but replacing the operator $\partial = d/dx$ with the one-variable Dunkl operator for $\Gamma = \mathbb{Z}_m$. Solutions to the hierarchy for given quiver data are described by an explicit formula, so checking that they satisfy the equations of the hierarchy amounts to a direct algebraic calculation. Note that we do not require a passage to an adelic Grassmannian $\mathrm{Gr}^{\mathrm{ad}}$ as in [W1] (for the details of how to define the appropriate notion in the present context see [BHY, BGK2]). It is worth mentioning that our initial motivation for the present work was to understand the moduli space of bispectral rings of differential operators constructed by Bakalov, Horozov and Yakimov in [BHY]. An attempt in that direction, also inspired by [W1], was made by Rothstein in [R], but the proofs in *loc. cit.* were omitted. Moreover, as our work shows, the answer to that question turns out to be simpler and more natural than it might be suggested by [R]. Apart from a brief remark in the concluding section, however, we do not discuss this problem in detail here, leaving it to a separate publication.

Our generalisation of the KP hierarchy is naturally related not just to a cyclic quiver but to a suitable framing of it, obtained by adding a vertex and a number of arrows. Different choices of the framing lead to different hierarchies and to different integrable multi-particle systems governing the pole dynamics. In the simplest case of one added arrow the classical-mechanical system in question can be identified with the rational Calogero–Moser system with the symmetry group $G = \mathbb{Z}_m \wr S_n$, while the other cases naturally lead to spin versions of that system. In the case $m = 1$ one recovers the Gibbons–Hermsen system [GH], while in general the systems we obtain this way seem new. Note that there exist various versions of the spin Calogero–Moser system associated to simple complex Lie algebras, see [LX] and references therein. However, to the best of our knowledge, spin versions of the Calogero–Moser system for $G = \mathbb{Z}_m \wr S_n$ and $m > 2$ did not appear in the literature previously. Because we define these systems as a commutative family of Hamiltonian flows on suitable Calogero–Moser spaces, the fact that the flows are complete is obvious from the start. As another by-product we also find a Lax matrix for the (spin) Calogero–Moser system for $G = \mathbb{Z}_m \wr S_n$. Note that G is not a Coxeter group for $m > 2$, so the corresponding Calogero–Moser system and its Lax matrix can not be obtained within the general framework of [BCS].

The plan of the paper is as follows. In Section 2 we recall the definition of the Cherednik algebra for $\Gamma = \mathbb{Z}_m$, use its microlocalisation to construct our version of the KP hierarchy in a Lax form, and introduce its spherical sub-hierarchy. In Section 3 we recall the definition of deformed preprojective algebras for an arbitrary quiver Q due to [CBH] and define quiver varieties associated to a framing of Q. We spell this out in detail for a cyclic quiver Q_0. By analogy with [W1], one calls these varieties Calogero–Moser spaces. In Section 4 we obtain our main results: we introduce a natural Hamiltonian dynamical system on a Calogero–Moser space and

construct rational solutions of our hierarchy starting from any point of this space. A similar result is obtained in Section 4.3 for the spherical sub-hierarchy. The integrable systems governing the pole dynamics for the constructed solutions are considered in more detail in Section 5. For that we first recall a link, due to Etingof and Ginzburg [EG], between the Calogero–Moser spaces and Cherednik algebras for $G = \mathbb{Z}_m \wr S_n$. We use this link to identify the flows of the spherical sub-hierarchy with the Calogero–Moser system for the wreath-product $\mathbb{Z}_m \wr S_n$. The particle system related to the full hierarchy is considered in Section 5.4; it can be viewed as a spin version of the Calogero–Moser system for $\mathbb{Z}_m \wr S_n$, where the spin variables belong to the group algebra $\mathbb{C}\mathbb{Z}_m$. Section 6 describes the multi-component version of our hierarchy; this extends the results of the previous two sections and leads to a construction of the general spin version of the Calogero–Moser system for $G = \mathbb{Z}_m \wr S_n$. The concluding section discusses some open questions, further directions and links.

Acknowledgement. We are grateful to Yu. Berest, W. Crawley-Boevey, P. Etingof and P. Iliev for stimulating discussions, and to G. Bellamy for useful comments. Both authors gratefully acknowledge the support by EPSRC under grant EP/K004999/1.

2. Cherednik algebra for the cyclic group and generalised KP hierarchy

2.1. **The Cherednik algebra of $\Gamma = \mathbb{Z}_m$.** Let $\Gamma = \{e, s, \dots, s^{m-1}\}$ be the multiplicative cyclic group of order m with generator s. Identifying Γ with the group $\mathbb{Z}_m$ of roots of unity, we have an action of Γ on $\mathbb{C}$, with s acting as the multiplication by a fixed primitive mth root of unity, μ. This induces an action of Γ on the ring $\mathbb{C}(x)$ of rational functions and differential operators of one complex variable. Explicitly, $s(f)(x) = f(\mu^{-1}x)$ for $f \in \mathbb{C}(x)$, and $s(\partial) = \mu\partial$, $\partial := \frac{d}{dx}$. Therefore, we can form the crossed product $\mathcal{D}(x,\partial) * \Gamma$, where $\mathcal{D}(x,\partial)$ denotes the ring of differential operators in x with rational coefficients. Recall that for a group G acting on an algebra A, the crossed product $A * G$ is spanned by the pairs (a, g) with $a \in A$, $g \in G$, with the multiplication defined by $(a, g)(b, h) = (ag(b), gh)$. Abbreviating (a, g) as ag, the multiplication consists of moving the group elements to the right using the rule $ga = g(a)g$ so that $(ag)(bh) = ag(b)gh$. For instance, in our situation we have

$$sx = \mu^{-1}xs \qquad \text{and} \qquad s\partial = \mu\partial s\,. \tag{2.1}$$

The differential filtration on the ring $\mathcal{D}(x,\partial)$ extends to a filtration on $\mathcal{D}(x,\partial) * \Gamma$, by placing the elements of Γ in degree 0.

The group algebra $\mathbb{C}\Gamma$ has a natural basis given by the idempotents

$$\epsilon_i = \frac{1}{m}\sum_{r=0}^{m-1} \mu^{-ir} s^r \in \mathbb{C}[\Gamma] \qquad\qquad (i = 0, \dots, m-1)\,. \tag{2.2}$$

Given $k = (k_0, \dots, k_{m-1}) \in \mathbb{C}^m$ and $\tau \neq 0$, one defines the Cherednik algebra $H_{\tau,k}(\Gamma)$ as the subalgebra of $\mathcal{D}(x,\partial)*\Gamma$, generated by s, x and the following element, called *Dunkl operator*:

$$y = \tau\partial - \frac{1}{x}\sum_{i=0}^{m-1} mk_i\epsilon_i\,. \tag{2.3}$$

It is clear from (2.1) that $sy = \mu ys$ and that

$$\epsilon_i x = x\epsilon_{i+1}\,, \qquad \epsilon_i y = y\epsilon_{i-1}\,. \tag{2.4}$$

(Here and in similar situations below the indices are always taken modulo m.) Also, the following relation between x and y is easy to check:

$$xy - yx = \sum_{i=0}^{m-1} \lambda_i \epsilon_i\,, \qquad \text{with} \quad \lambda_i = m(k_{i-1} - k_i) - \tau\,. \tag{2.5}$$

It follows that the algebra $H_{\tau,k}$ can be described by generators and relations as

$$H_{\tau,k} \simeq (\mathbb{C}\langle x, y\rangle * \Gamma)/(xy - yx - \lambda)\,, \qquad \lambda = \sum_{i=0}^{m-1} \lambda_i \epsilon_i \in \mathbb{C}\Gamma\,, \tag{2.6}$$

where $\mathbb{C}\langle x, y\rangle$ denotes the free algebra on x, y and the action of Γ is given by $s(x) = \mu^{-1}x$, $s(y) = \mu y$.

The algebra $H_{\tau,k}$ is a particular example of a rational Cherednik algebra, which can be associated to any complex reflection group (see [EG]). It has a PBW property, namely, a vector space isomorphism $H_{\tau,k} \simeq \mathbb{C}[x] \otimes \mathbb{C}\Gamma \otimes \mathbb{C}[y]$, which means that every element can be uniquely presented as a linear combination of the terms $x^i \gamma y^j$ with $i, j \geqslant 0$ and $\gamma \in \Gamma$. The inclusion $H_{\tau,k} \subset \mathcal{D}(x, \partial) * \Gamma$ induces a filtration on $H_{\tau,k}$, called *differential filtration*, with $\deg y = 1$, $\deg x = 0$, $\deg \gamma = 0$.

The algebra (2.6) has also appeared in the context of non-commutative deformations of Kleinian singularities [Ho, CBH], and it is isomorphic to the deformed preprojective algebra of a cyclic quiver as defined in [CBH] (we will recall that definition and isomorphism in Section 3 below). Note that if we rescale τ and k_i simultaneously, the resulting Cherednik algebra will not change. For $\tau = 0$ one defines $H_{0,k}$ by replacing the Dunkl embedding with its quasi-classical counterpart, see [EG]; this agrees with the isomorphism (2.6).

2.2. **Microlocalisation of $H_{\tau,k}$.** The well-known construction of the KP hierarchy uses the ring of pseudo-differential operators $\mathcal{D}(x, \partial)((\partial^{-1}))$. Our generalisation is based instead on a microlocalisation $(\mathcal{D}(x, \partial) * \Gamma)((y^{-1}))$, where y is the Dunkl operator (2.3). To construct such a microlocalisation explicitly, we will first consider the Ore localisation of $H_{\tau,k}$ at y and then pass to a completion.

We begin by introducing the parameters c_γ, $\gamma \in \Gamma$ determined from

$$\sum_{i=0}^{m-1} m k_i \epsilon_i = \sum_{\gamma \in \Gamma} c_\gamma \gamma\,. \tag{2.7}$$

Explicitly, $c_\gamma = \sum_{i=0}^{m-1} \mu^{-ij} k_i$ for $\gamma = s^j$. The following relation in $H_{\tau,k}$ is immediate from (2.3) and (2.7):

$$ya - ay = \tau\partial(a) - \sum_{\gamma \in \Gamma \setminus \{e\}} c_\gamma x^{-1}(\gamma a - a\gamma) \qquad \text{for any } a = a(x) \in \mathbb{C}[x]\,.$$

A similar commutation relation holds for any $f \in \mathbb{C}[x] * \Gamma$. Namely, let us define an algebra automorphism θ of $\mathbb{C}[x] * \Gamma$ by $\theta(s) = \mu s$, $\theta(x) = x$. In other words,

$$\theta\Big(\sum_{i=0}^{m-1} a_i(x) s^i\Big) = \sum_{i=0}^{m-1} a_i(x) \mu^i s^i\,.$$

Clearly, $\theta^m = 1$. With this notation, one has

$$yf - \theta^{-1}(f)y = \tau\partial(f) - \sum_{\gamma\in\Gamma\setminus\{e\}} c_\gamma x^{-1}(\gamma f - f\gamma) \quad \text{for any } f \in \mathbb{C}[x]*\Gamma\,. \tag{2.8}$$

Here ∂ acts on $\mathbb{C}[x]*\Gamma$ by the formula $\partial\big(\sum_i a_i(x)s^i\big) = \sum_i \partial a_i(x)s^i$. Note that for $a = \sum_i a_i(x)s^i$ we have

$$x^{-1}(s^j a - a s^j) = \sum_i x^{-1}\big(a_i(\mu^{-j}x) - a_i(x)\big)s^{i+j}\,,$$

therefore, the denominators in (2.8) cancel, as expected. The right-hand side of (2.8) defines a linear map $D\colon \mathbb{C}[x]*\Gamma \to \mathbb{C}[x]*\Gamma$, that is,

$$D(f) = \tau\partial(f) - \sum_{\gamma\in\Gamma\setminus\{e\}} c_\gamma x^{-1}[\gamma, f]\,. \tag{2.9}$$

From (2.8) we have $yf = \theta^{-1}(f)y + D(f)$. By induction, for any $n \in \mathbb{N}$,

$$y^n f = \sum_{p=0}^{n} \sum_{\substack{i_0,\dots,i_p\geqslant 0\\ i_0+\dots+i_p=n-p}} \theta^{-i_0} D\theta^{-i_1}\dots D\theta^{-i_p}(f)y^{n-p}\,. \tag{2.10}$$

Note that an application of D to a polynomial in $\mathbb{C}[x]*\Gamma$ lowers its degree, therefore the right-hand side of (2.10) will terminate at $p = \deg(f)$. This implies that the set $\{y^k \,|\, k \in \mathbb{N}\}$ is (right and left) Ore, so let $H_{\tau,k}[y^{-1}]$ be the corresponding right localisation. By the PBW property of $H_{\tau,k}$, every element of $H_{\tau,k}[y^{-1}]$ has a unique presentation as a finite sum $u = \sum_{i\in\mathbb{Z}} u_i y^i$ with $u_i \in \mathbb{C}[x]*\Gamma$. The explicit form of the multiplication in $H_{\tau,k}[y^{-1}]$ can be derived from (2.10). Namely, one first finds that

$$y^{-1} f = \sum_{p=0}^{\infty} (-1)^p (\theta D)^p \theta(f) y^{-1-p}\,. \tag{2.11}$$

From that, using induction we get

$$y^{-n} f = \sum_{p=0}^{\infty} (-1)^p \sum_{\substack{\varepsilon_1+\dots+\varepsilon_{n+p-1}=p\\ \varepsilon_i\in\{0,1\}}} \theta D^{\varepsilon_1}\theta D^{\varepsilon_2}\dots D^{\varepsilon_{n+p-1}}\theta(f) y^{-n-p}\,. \tag{2.12}$$

Note that if f is not polynomial but, say, rational, $f \in \mathbb{C}(x)*\Gamma$, then the sum in (2.11) and (2.12) is no longer finite. Therefore, in analogy with the notion of formal pseudo-differential operators, let us introduce

$$\mathcal{P} = \left\{ \sum_{i\geqslant 0} f_j y^{N-j} \;\;|\;\; f_j \in \mathbb{C}(x)*\Gamma\,,\; N \in \mathbb{Z} \right\}. \tag{2.13}$$

Addition in $\mathcal{P}$ is obvious, while the multiplication is determined by the rules (2.10)–(2.12). The fact that the multiplication is associative follows from its associativity in $H_{\tau,k}[y^{-1}]$. Indeed, checking the associativity in every degree in y requires checking an algebraic relation involving a finite number of the coefficients $f_j \in \mathbb{C}(x)*\Gamma$ and operations θ and D. Since we know that this relations hold for arbitrary polynomial coefficients f_j, they must hold identically. Hence, the multiplication in $\mathcal{P}$ is associative; note that it depends on the parameters τ, k entering into the definition of D.

Fixing N in the definition of $\mathcal{P}$, one gets a subspace $\mathcal{P}_N \subset \mathcal{P}$ and an increasing chain $\cdots \subset \mathcal{P}_N \subset \mathcal{P}_{N+1} \subset \ldots$, which makes $\mathcal{P}$ into a filtered ring. For any $S = \sum_{j\geqslant 0} f_j y^{N-j}$ in $\mathcal{P}$, we have $S = S_- + S_-$ where

$$S_- = \sum_{j>N} f_j\, y^{N-j}\,, \qquad\qquad S_+ = \sum_{j=0}^{N} f_j\, y^{N-j}\,. \tag{2.14}$$

(In the case $N < 0$ we put $S_- = S$ and $S_+ = 0$.) This defines a direct sum decomposition $\mathcal{P} = \mathcal{P}_- \oplus \mathcal{P}_+$ with

$$\mathcal{P}_- = \mathcal{P}_{-1} = \left\{ \sum_{j\geqslant 1} f_j y^{-j} \right\} \qquad \text{and} \qquad \mathcal{P}_+ = \left\{ \sum_{j=0}^{N} f_j y^j \;\;\middle|\;\; N \geqslant 0 \right\}.$$

From the formula for y it easily follows that $\mathcal{P}_+ = \mathcal{D}(x,\partial) * \Gamma$. The following properties of the multiplication in the ring $\mathcal{P}$ should be clear:

$$(Sf)_\pm = S_\pm \cdot f \qquad \forall S \in \mathcal{P}\,,\ \forall f \in \mathbb{C}(x) * \Gamma\,.$$

Remark 2.1. An alternative construction of the ring $\mathcal{P}$ is by applying microlocalisation in the sense of [AVdBVO]. Indeed, $\mathcal{P}$ is isomorphic to the microlocalisation $\mathcal{Q}_S^\mu$ of $R = \mathcal{D}(x,\partial) * \Gamma$ at the multiplicatively closed set $S = \{y^k \,|\, k \in \mathbb{N}_0\}$. This can be checked either at the level of the associated graded rings, using Propositions 3.5 and 3.10 of *loc. cit.*, or by direct comparison.

Remark 2.2. In the definition of $\mathcal{P}$ one can set the coefficients f_j to be from any ring $\mathcal{F} * \Gamma$, closed under the action of D. For instance, we may replace $\mathcal{F} = \mathbb{C}(x)$ by $\mathbb{C}[[x]]$, $\mathbb{C}((x))$ or by the rings of functions, analytic (respectively, meromorphic) near $x = 0$. We may further replace any such $\mathcal{F}$ by a ring of matrices $\mathrm{Mat}(n, \mathcal{F})$.

Remark 2.3. The formulas (2.10), (2.12) can be rewritten using the operations $D_i := \theta^{-i+1} D \theta^i$. Then for any $n \in \mathbb{N}$ one has:

$$y^n \theta^n(f) = \sum_{\varepsilon_1,\ldots,\varepsilon_n \in \{0,1\}} D_1^{\varepsilon_1} \ldots D_n^{\varepsilon_n}(f) y^{n-\varepsilon_1-\cdots-\varepsilon_n}\,, \tag{2.15}$$

$$y^{-n}\theta^{-n}(f) = \sum_{p=0}^{\infty} (-1)^p \sum_{\substack{l_1,\ldots,l_n \geqslant 0 \\ l_1+\cdots+l_n = p}} (D_0)^{l_n} (D_{-1})^{l_{n-1}} \ldots (D_{1-n})^{l_1}(f)\, y^{-n-p}\,. \tag{2.16}$$

2.3. **Generalised KP hierarchy.** Let $\mathcal{P}$ be as in Remark 2.2 above, i.e. we allow arbitrary coefficents $f_j \in \mathcal{F} * \Gamma$, where $\mathcal{F}$ is either the ring $\mathbb{C}(x)$ of rational functions or one of its variants. Consider an element $L \in \mathcal{P}$ of the form

$$L = y + \sum_{i\geqslant 0} f_i y^{-i}\,, \tag{2.17}$$

where the coefficients $f_i \in \mathcal{F} * \Gamma$ depend on an infinite number of additional variables $t_1, t_2, \ldots$, called times. Our generalisation of the KP hierarchy is the following system of equations:

$$\frac{\partial L}{\partial t_k} = \big[(L^k)_+, L\big]\,, \qquad\qquad k = 1, 2, \ldots\,. \tag{2.18}$$

Here $(L^k)_+$ denotes the positive part of L^k according to the notation (2.14), and $[\cdot,\cdot]$ is the commutator bracket, $[A, B] = AB - BA$. The system (2.18) is viewed as a hierarchy of non-linear equations on the infinite number of dependent variables

$f_i(x) = f_i(x; t_1, t_2, \dots) \in \mathcal{F} * \Gamma$. When $m = 1$ we have $\Gamma = \{e\}$ and $y = \partial$, in which case the system (2.18) turns into the standard presentation of the KP hierarchy.

Since $L \in y + \mathcal{P}_0$, each equation in (2.18) can be viewed as a flow on $\mathcal{P}_0$. The following results are analogous to the similar standard facts about the KP hierarchy.

Proposition 2.4. (1) *The equations* (2.18) *imply the zero-curvature equations:*

$$\Big[\frac{\partial}{\partial t_k} - (L^k)_+ \,,\, \frac{\partial}{\partial t_l} - (L^l)_+\Big] = 0 \qquad\qquad \forall\ k, l \in \mathbb{N}\,. \tag{2.19}$$

(2) *The system* (2.18) *is consistent, that is, the equations of the hierarchy define commuting flows on* $\mathcal{P}$.

Proofs of both statements are the same as for the usual KP hierarchy, see, e.g., [Di, Sec. 1.6]. □

For the usual KP hierarchy, it is customary to assume that $f_0 = 0$ in (2.17). The analogous condition in our case is as follows. For any $f \in \mathcal{F} * \Gamma$, denote by $f_\gamma \in \mathcal{F}$ the coefficient in the decomposition $f = \sum_{\gamma\in\Gamma} f_\gamma \gamma$; in particular, f_e denotes the coefficient at the identity element. Then our assumption on the coefficient f_0 in (2.17) will be as follows:

$$(f_0)_e = 0\,. \tag{2.20}$$

To see that this is preserved by the flows of the hierarchy, rewrite the equations (2.18) as

$$\frac{\partial L}{\partial t_k} = -\big[(L^k)_-, L\big]\,. \tag{2.21}$$

Writing $(L^k)_-$ as $hy^{-1} + \dots$, we obtain that $\frac{\partial f_0}{\partial t_k} = \theta^{-1}(h) - h$, from which $\frac{\partial (f_0)_e}{\partial t_k} = (\theta^{-1}(h) - h)_e = 0$, as needed.

Let us recall that for the KP hierarchy ($m = 1$), assuming $f_0 = 0$, one has $L_+ = \partial$ and so the first equation in (2.18) gives simply that $\frac{\partial L}{\partial t_1} = \partial(L)$, which means that one can set $t_1 = x$. Since in our case f_0 is nonzero, the first equation becomes more complicated and we can no longer identify x with one of the time variables. Still, the zero-curvature equations (2.19) for all k, l less than some given n lead to a closed set of nonlinear equations on a finite number of coefficients of L. For example, to get an analogue of the usual KP equation, one can take the zero-curvature equations for all $k, l \in \{1, 2, 3\}$. However, the calculations become too cumbersome to be carried out explicitly.

Our main goal will be to construct some explicit solutions to this hierarchy. The solutions will be constructed in the form

$$L = MyM^{-1}\,, \qquad\qquad \text{where} \quad M \in 1 + \mathcal{P}_-\,. \tag{2.22}$$

Writing M as $M = 1 + \sum_{i\geqslant 1} w_i(x) y^{-i}$, we can calculate M^{-1}, term by term, from the equation $M^{-1}M = 1$:

$$M^{-1} = 1 - w_1 y^{-1} + (w_1\theta(w_1) - w_2)y^{-2} + \dots\,.$$

Substituting these into (2.22) gives

$$L = y - (\theta^{-1}(w_1) - w_1) + (-D(w_1) + w_2 - \theta^{-1}(w_2) - w_1^2 + \theta^{-1}(w_1)w_1)y^{-1} + \dots\,.$$

We therefore can view (2.22) as a non-linear transformation between the variables f_j and w_i, so that

$$f_0 = -\theta^{-1}(w_1) + w_1\,, \quad f_1 = -D(w_1) + w_2 - \theta^{-1}(w_2) - w_1^2 + \theta^{-1}(w_1)w_1\,,$$

and so on. It is clear from the first formula that (2.20) is automatically satisfied.

Remark 2.5. The above M^{-1} is the left inverse to M. In the same manner one can construct the right inverse. By a standard argument, they coincide so M^{-1} is the two-sided inverse.

The following result is straightforward.

Proposition 2.6. *Suppose $M \in 1 + \mathcal{P}_-$ satisfies the equation*

$$\frac{\partial M}{\partial t_k} = -(L^k)_- M$$

for some k. Then $L = MyM^{-1}$ satisfies the equation

$$\frac{\partial L}{\partial t_k} = -\big[(L^k)_-, L\big]\,.$$

2.4. **Spherical sub-hierarchy.** Now suppose that L is as above and in addition it satisfies the following property with respect to the action of the group Γ:

$$\epsilon_i L = L\epsilon_{i-1}\,. \tag{2.23}$$

Then it is easy to see that such condition is only compatible with the equations (2.18) when k is divisible by m. Therefore, in this case we have a sub-hierarchy consisting of the equations

$$\frac{\partial L}{\partial t_{mj}} = \big[(L^{mj})_+, L\big]\,, \qquad\qquad j \in \mathbb{N}\,. \tag{2.24}$$

It is convenient to rewrite this as equations on $\widetilde{L} = L^m$. It follows from (2.24) that

$$\frac{\partial \widetilde{L}}{\partial t_{mj}} = \big[(\widetilde{L}^j)_+, \widetilde{L}\big]\,, \qquad\qquad j \in \mathbb{N}\,. \tag{2.25}$$

We have

$$\widetilde{L} = y^m + \sum_{a>0} g_a y^{m-1-a}\,, \qquad \epsilon_i \widetilde{L} = \widetilde{L}\epsilon_i\,, \qquad g_a \in \mathcal{F} * \Gamma\,. \tag{2.26}$$

(The fact that $g_0 = 0$ is an easy corollary of (2.20).)

We will call the hierarchy (2.25)–(2.26) the *spherical sub-hierarchy*. It can be further decoupled into m independent hierarchies. Namely, decompose $\widetilde{L}$ as

$$\widetilde{L} = \sum_{\ell=0}^{m-1} \widetilde{L}_\ell\,, \qquad\qquad \widetilde{L}_\ell = \epsilon_\ell \widetilde{L} = \epsilon_\ell \widetilde{L} \epsilon_\ell\,.$$

Then the system (2.25) splits into m independent systems for each of $\widetilde{L}_\ell$:

$$\frac{\partial \widetilde{L}_\ell}{\partial t_{mj}} = \big[(\widetilde{L}_\ell^j)_+, \widetilde{L}_\ell\big]\,, \qquad \widetilde{L}_\ell = \epsilon_\ell y^m \epsilon_\ell + \sum_{a>0} \epsilon_\ell g_a y^{m-1-a} \epsilon_\ell\,. \tag{2.27}$$

In fact, the systems (2.27) with different ℓ are all equivalent to each other, up to a change of parameters, and if $\widetilde{L}_0, \dots, \widetilde{L}_{m-1}$ are solutions to each of these hierarchies then $\widetilde{L} := \widetilde{L}_0 + \dots + \widetilde{L}_{m-1}$ is a solution to (2.25).

Remark 2.7. Although the cyclic quiver did not appear explicitly above, the Cherednik algebra $H_{\tau,k}(\mathbb{Z}_m)$ can be in fact interpreted as a deformed preprojective algebra associated to the cyclic quiver with m vertices, see Section 3.2 below. The role of quivers will become more apparent when we turn to constructing rational solutions of the hierarchy in Section 4.

3. Deformed preprojective algebras and Calogero–Moser spaces

We begin by defining the deformed preprojective algebras due to Crawley-Boevey and Holland, and by recalling some facts about their representations; the interested reader should consult [CBH, CB2] for the details. Consider a quiver Q, an oriented graph with the set of vertices I and arrows Q. For an arrow $a\colon i \to j$, we use the notation $t(a), h(a)$ to denote the tail i and the head j of a. Consider the double quiver $\overline{Q}$, obtained by adjoining a reverse arrow $a^*\colon j \to i$ for every arrow $a\colon i \to j$ in Q. Let $\mathbb{C}\overline{Q}$ be the path algebra of $\overline{Q}$; it has basis the paths in $\overline{Q}$, including a trivial path e_i for each vertex. We use the convention that for $a\colon i \to j$ and $b\colon j \to k$, the product ba represents the path $i \to j \to k$ and that $ba = 0$ if $h(a) \neq t(b)$.

Given $\lambda \in \mathbb{C}^I$, the *deformed preprojective algebra* $\Pi^\lambda(Q)$ is defined as the quotient of $\mathbb{C}\overline{Q}$ by the following relation:

$$\sum_{a\in Q} (aa^* - a^*a) = \sum_{i\in I} \lambda_i e_i\,.$$

Multiplying this relation by e_i, we obtain an equivalent set of relations, one for each vertex:

$$\sum_{\substack{a\in Q\\ h(a)=i}} aa^* - \sum_{\substack{a\in Q\\ t(a)=i}} a^*a = \lambda_i e_i\,, \qquad\qquad i \in I\,. \tag{3.1}$$

For simplicity, we will simply write Π^λ for $\Pi^\lambda(Q)$.

Representations of $\overline{Q}$ of dimension $\alpha \in \mathbb{N}_0^I$ are given by attaching vector spaces $V_i = \mathbb{C}^{\alpha_i}$ to each vertex $i \in I$, with the arrows of the quiver represented by linear maps $X_a\colon V_{t(a)} \to V_{h(a)}$ (with each trivial path e_i represented by the identity map on V_i). The set of all representations of a given dimension is, therefore,

$$\mathtt{Rep}(\mathbb{C}\overline{Q}, \alpha) = \bigoplus_{a\in Q} \mathtt{Mat}(\alpha_{h(a)} \times \alpha_{t(a)}, \mathbb{C}) \oplus \mathtt{Mat}(\alpha_{t(a)} \times \alpha_{h(a)}, \mathbb{C})\,.$$

Isomorphism classes of representations correspond to orbits under the group

$$G(\alpha) = \Big(\prod_{i\in I} \mathtt{GL}(\alpha_i, \mathbb{C})\Big) / \mathbb{C}^\times\,, \tag{3.2}$$

acting by conjugation. Here $\mathbb{C}^\times$ denotes the diagonal subgroup of scalar matrices, acting trivially on $\mathtt{Rep}(\mathbb{C}\overline{Q}, \alpha)$. Semi-simple representations correspond to closed orbits.

We have naturally $\mathtt{Rep}(\Pi^\lambda, \alpha) \subset \mathtt{Rep}(\mathbb{C}\overline{Q}, \alpha)$ as a subvariety cut out by the relations (3.1):

$$\sum_{\substack{a\in Q\\ h(a)=i}} X_a X_{a^*} - \sum_{\substack{a\in Q\\ t(a)=i}} X_{a^*} X_a = \lambda_i 1_{V_i}\,, \qquad\qquad i \in I\,. \tag{3.3}$$

By adding these and taking trace, we obtain

$$\lambda \cdot \alpha = \sum_{i \in I} \lambda_i \alpha_i = 0\,. \tag{3.4}$$

Consider the quotient $\mathtt{Rep}(\Pi^\lambda, \alpha)//G(\alpha)$, whose points correspond to semi-simple representations of Π^λ of dimension α. We will be mostly interested in the situation where λ and α are such that a general representations in $\mathtt{Rep}(\Pi^\lambda, \alpha)$ is simple. In this case, the following result is known by [CB2, Corollary 1.4 and Lemma 6.5].

Proposition 3.1. *Let $p(\alpha) = 1 + \sum_{a \in Q} \alpha_{t(a)}\alpha_{h(a)} - \alpha \cdot \alpha$, where $\alpha \cdot \alpha = \sum_{i \in I} \alpha_i^2$. If a general representation in $\mathtt{Rep}(\Pi^\lambda, \alpha)$ is simple, then $\mathtt{Rep}(\Pi^\lambda, \alpha)//G(\alpha)$ is a reduced and irreducible scheme of dimension $2p(\alpha)$, smooth at the points corresponding to (the isomorphism classes of) simple representations. In particular, if all representations in $\mathtt{Rep}(\Pi^\lambda, \alpha)$ are simple, then $\mathtt{Rep}(\Pi^\lambda, \alpha)//G(\alpha)$ is a smooth connected affine variety of dimension $2p(\alpha)$.*

Let us remark that the varieties $\mathtt{Rep}(\Pi^\lambda, \alpha)//G(\alpha)$ can be obtained by Hamiltonian reduction [MW]. Indeed, the space $\mathtt{Rep}(\mathbb{C}\overline{Q}, \alpha)$ has a natural complex symplectic structure

$$\omega = \sum_{a \in Q} \mathrm{tr}(\mathrm{d}X_{a^*} \wedge \mathrm{d}X_a)\,, \tag{3.5}$$

invariant under $G(\alpha)$. The left-hand side of (3.3) can then be viewed as a component μ_i of a moment map μ for the action of $G(\alpha)$ on $\mathtt{Rep}(\mathbb{C}\overline{Q}, \alpha)$. Therefore, we can view $\mathtt{Rep}(\Pi^\lambda, \alpha)$ as a fibre $\mu^{-1}(\overline{\lambda})$ of the moment map at $\overline{\lambda} = \sum_{i \in I} \lambda_i 1_{V_i}$:

$$\mathtt{Rep}(\Pi^\lambda, \alpha)//G(\alpha) = \mu^{-1}(\overline{\lambda})//G(\alpha)\,. \tag{3.6}$$

As a consequence, in the situation when $G(\alpha)$ acts freely, the quotient (3.6) carries a natural symplectic structure.

3.1. **Quiver varieties.** Let Q_0 be an arbitrary quiver with the vertex set I. A framing of Q_0 is a quiver Q that has one additional vertex, denoted ∞, and a number of arrows $i \to \infty$ from the vertices of Q_0 (multiple arrows are allowed). Given $\alpha \in \mathbb{N}_0^I$ and $\lambda \in \mathbb{C}^I$, we extend them from Q_0 to Q by putting $\alpha_\infty = 1$ and $\lambda_\infty = -\lambda \cdot \alpha$. Thus, we put

$$\boldsymbol{\alpha} = (1, \alpha)\,, \qquad \boldsymbol{\lambda} = (-\lambda \cdot \alpha, \lambda)\,. \tag{3.7}$$

This choice ensures that $\boldsymbol{\lambda} \cdot \boldsymbol{\alpha} = 0$. Consider the space $\mathtt{Rep}(\Pi^{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}, \boldsymbol{\alpha})$ of representations of the deformed preprojective algebra of Q of dimension $\boldsymbol{\alpha}$. The quotients

$$\mathfrak{M}_{\alpha,\lambda}(Q) := \mathtt{Rep}(\Pi^{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}, \boldsymbol{\alpha})//G(\boldsymbol{\alpha}) \tag{3.8}$$

are closely related to Nakajima quiver varieties, see [CB2], pp. 261–262. Note that since $\alpha_\infty = 1$, we have

$$G(\boldsymbol{\alpha}) = \Big(\prod_{i \in I \sqcup \{\infty\}} \mathtt{GL}(\alpha_i, \mathbb{C}) \Big) / \mathbb{C}^\times \simeq \mathtt{GL}(\alpha) := \prod_{i \in I} \mathtt{GL}(\alpha_i, \mathbb{C})\,, \tag{3.9}$$

where the group on the right-hand side acts on $\bigoplus_{i \in I} V_i$.

Recall that Kac defines in [Kac] the root system $\Delta(Q)$ for an arbitrary quiver Q. Let us say that $\lambda \in \mathbb{C}^I$ is regular if $\lambda \cdot \alpha \neq 0$ for any $\alpha \in \Delta(Q_0)$. Then the following result is a corollary of [CB2, Theorem 1.2], (cf. [BCE, Proposition 3]):

Proposition 3.2. *Let $\boldsymbol{\alpha}$ and $\boldsymbol{\lambda}$ be as in* (3.7)*, with λ regular. Choose a framing Q of Q_0 and let $\Pi^{\boldsymbol{\lambda}} = \Pi^{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}(Q)$. Then there is a $\Pi^{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}$-module of dimension $\boldsymbol{\alpha}$ if and only if $\boldsymbol{\alpha} \in \Delta_+(Q)$, where $\Delta_+(Q)$ is the set of positive roots of Q. Moreover, every such module is simple.*

Combining this with Prop. 3.1, we conclude that for $(1, \alpha) \in \Delta_+(Q)$ and regular $\lambda \in \mathbb{C}^I$ the variety $\mathfrak{M}_{\alpha,\lambda}(Q)$ is smooth, of dimension $2p(\boldsymbol{\alpha})$. Note that for imaginary roots $\boldsymbol{\alpha}$ one has $p(\boldsymbol{\alpha}) > 0$, while for real roots $p(\boldsymbol{\alpha}) = 0$. Furthermore, if $\boldsymbol{\alpha}$ is a real positive root, then there is a unique representation of $\Pi^{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}$ of dimension $\boldsymbol{\alpha}$ up to isomorphism [CB3, Proposition 1.2]. This means that in this case $\mathfrak{M}_{\alpha,\lambda}(Q)$ consists of one point.

3.2. **Case of a cyclic quiver.** Now let Q_0 be a cyclic oriented quiver with the set of vertices $I = \mathbb{Z}/m\mathbb{Z} = \{0, 1, \dots, m-1\}$ and m arrows $a_i \colon i+1 \to i$. The double quiver $\overline{Q}_0$ is obtained by adding the reverse arrows $a_i^* \colon i \to i+1$. For $\lambda \in \mathbb{C}^I$, the deformed preprojective algebra Π^λ is the quotient of $\mathbb{C}\overline{Q}_0$ by the relations

$$a_i a_i^* - a_{i-1}^* a_{i-1} = \lambda_i e_i \,, \qquad\qquad i \in I \,. \tag{3.10}$$

If $m = 1$, then we have a one-loop quiver Q_0, so Π^λ in this case is isomorphic to $\mathbb{C}\langle a, a^*\rangle/\{aa^* - a^*a = \lambda\}$. For $m > 1$ there is an isomorphism between Π^λ and Cherednik algebra $H_{\tau,k}(\mathbb{Z}_m)$, given by

$$a_i \mapsto \epsilon_i x \,, \qquad a_i^* \mapsto y\epsilon_i \,, \qquad e_i \mapsto \epsilon_i \,, \tag{3.11}$$

with the parameters λ_i and τ, k related by (2.5).

3.3. **Calogero–Moser spaces.** Let Q_0 be a cyclic oriented quiver with the set of vertices $I = \mathbb{Z}/m\mathbb{Z}$ as above. Calogero–Moser spaces are the varieties (3.8) associated to certain framings of Q_0. We will consider one of the following framings:

$$Q = Q_0 \sqcup \{b_{i,\alpha} \colon i \to \infty \,|\, i \in I \,,\ \alpha = 1, \dots, d\} \,, \qquad d \in \mathbb{N} \,, \tag{3.12}$$

$$Q = Q_0 \sqcup \{b_{\ell,\alpha} \colon \ell \to \infty \,|\, \alpha = 1, \dots, d\} \,, \qquad \ell \in I \,, \quad d \in \mathbb{N} \,, \tag{3.13}$$

$$Q = Q_0 \sqcup \{b_i \colon i \to \infty \,|\, i \in I\} \,, \tag{3.14}$$

$$Q = Q_0 \sqcup \{b_\ell \colon \ell \to \infty\} \,, \qquad \ell \in I \,. \tag{3.15}$$

Quivers (3.12) and (3.13) have md and d added arrows, respectively; they will only be needed in Section 6. The other two quivers correspond to $d = 1$.

For $\lambda = (\lambda_0, \dots, \lambda_{m-1}) \in \mathbb{C}^m$ and $\alpha = (\alpha_0, \dots, \alpha_{m-1}) \in \mathbb{N}_0^m$ we put $\boldsymbol{\alpha} = (1, \alpha)$ and $\boldsymbol{\lambda} = (-\lambda \cdot \alpha, \lambda)$ and consider representations of $\Pi^{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}$ of dimension $\boldsymbol{\alpha}$. Each representation consists of a vector space

$$V_\infty \oplus V_0 \oplus \dots \oplus V_{m-1} \,, \qquad \text{where } \ V_\infty = \mathbb{C} \,, \quad V_i = \mathbb{C}^{\alpha_i} \,,\ i \in I \,, \tag{3.16}$$

together with a collection of linear maps representing the arrows of $\overline{Q}$, which should satisfy the relations (3.3). It is more convenient to consider representations of $(\Pi^{\boldsymbol{\lambda}})^{\mathrm{opp}}$, i.e., right $\Pi^{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}$-modules (this is in agreement with the conventions in [BCE]). Therefore, analogously to (3.8)–(3.9), we define the Calogero–Moser space associated to a framing Q of Q_0 as

$$\mathcal{C}_{\alpha,\lambda}(Q) = \mathtt{Rep}\big((\Pi^{\boldsymbol{\lambda}})^{\mathrm{opp}}, \boldsymbol{\alpha}\big)//\mathtt{GL}(\alpha) \,, \qquad\qquad \alpha \in \mathbb{N}_0^m \,,\ \lambda \in \mathbb{C}^m \,. \tag{3.17}$$

Since representations of $(\Pi^{\boldsymbol{\lambda}})^{\mathrm{opp}}$ can be realised as dual to those of $\Pi^{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}$, all the properties of $\mathtt{Rep}(\Pi^{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}, \boldsymbol{\alpha})$ discussed earlier remain valid in this setting. In particular, for regular λ the varieties $\mathcal{C}_{\alpha,\lambda}$ are smooth. Recall that, for a cyclic quiver Q_0, the

root system $\Delta(Q_0) \subset \mathbb{Z}^m$ is isomorphic to the affine root system of type $\widetilde{A}_{m-1}$. Under this isomorphism, the roots in $\Delta(Q_0)$ are obtained by writing the roots of $\widetilde{A}_{m-1}$ in the basis of simple roots $\varepsilon_0, \dots, \varepsilon_{m-1}$. In particular, imaginary roots $n\delta = n(\varepsilon_0 + \dots + \varepsilon_{m-1})$ correspond to $\alpha = (n, \dots, n) \in \Delta(Q_0)$. The real roots are of the form $n\delta \pm (\varepsilon_i + \dots + \varepsilon_{j-1})$ with $1 \leqslant i < j \leqslant m-1$. Therefore, $\lambda \in \mathbb{C}^m$ is regular iff

$$\lambda_0 + \dots + \lambda_{m-1} \neq 0\,, \qquad n(\lambda_0 + \dots + \lambda_{m-1}) \neq \lambda_i + \dots + \lambda_{j-1} \tag{3.18}$$

for all $n \in \mathbb{Z}$ and $1 \leqslant i < j \leqslant m-1$. Assuming that λ_i are the same as in (2.5), we conclude that the parameters $(\tau, k) \in \mathbb{C}^{m+1}$ are regular iff $\tau \neq 0$ and

$$\frac{k_i - k_j}{\tau} \notin \frac{j-i}{m} + \mathbb{Z} \qquad \text{for} \quad 0 \leqslant i \neq j \leqslant m-1\,. \tag{3.19}$$

Below we will assume that the parameters are regular, unless specified otherwise.

Let us describe the varieties $\mathcal{C}_{\alpha,\lambda}$ more concretely. We start by taking Q as in (3.14). A right action of $\Pi^{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}$ on a vector space (3.16) consists of a collection of maps

$$X_{a_i}\colon V_i \to V_{i+1}\,, \qquad X_{a_i^*}\colon V_{i+1} \to V_i\,, \qquad X_{b_i}\colon \mathbb{C} \to V_i\,, \qquad X_{b_i^*}\colon V_i \to \mathbb{C}\,.$$

Note that the maps go in the opposite direction to arrows because we are considering representations of the opposite algebra. To simplify the notation, put

$$X_i := X_{a_i}\,, \qquad Y_i := X_{a_i^*}\,, \qquad v_i := X_{b_i}\,, \qquad w_i := X_{b_i^*}\,. \tag{3.20}$$

Relations (3.1) then read as follows:

$$Y_iX_i - X_{i-1}Y_{i-1} - v_iw_i = \lambda_i 1_{V_i} \qquad (i \in \mathbb{Z}/m\mathbb{Z}), \tag{3.21}$$

$$\sum_{i\in I} w_iv_i = \lambda_\infty\,. \tag{3.22}$$

Note that since we are assuming that $\lambda_\infty = -\lambda\cdot\alpha$, the last relation follows from (3.21) automatically by adding up and taking traces. Recall that the points of $\mathcal{C}_{\alpha,\lambda}$ are the equivalence classes of the above data X_i, Y_i, v_i, w_i under the action of $\mathtt{GL}(\alpha)$.

It will be convenient to put $V = \bigoplus_{i\in I} V_i$ and denote the projection onto the i-th direct summand in V as e_i, so $e_i\big|_{V_j} = \delta_{i,j}1_{V_i}$. Let us extend maps (3.20) up to $X_i, Y_i\colon V \to V$, $v_i\colon \mathbb{C} \to V$, $w_i\colon V \to \mathbb{C}$ in an obvious way (e.g., $Y_i\big|_{V_j} = 0$ for $j \neq i+1$) and put

$$X = \sum_{i\in I} X_i\,, \qquad Y = \sum_{i\in I} Y_i\,, \qquad v = \sum_{i\in I} v_i\,, \qquad w = \sum_{i\in I} w_i\,. \tag{3.23}$$

Then (3.21) is equivalent to

$$YX - XY - \sum_{i\in I} v_iw_i = \sum_{i\in I} \lambda_i e_i\,, \tag{3.24}$$

and we have

$$e_{i+1}X = Xe_i = X_i\,, \quad e_iY = Ye_{i+1} = Y_i\,, \qquad e_iv = v_i\,, \quad we_i = w_i\,. \tag{3.25}$$

In this notation, the action of $g \in \mathtt{GL}(\alpha) \subset \mathrm{End}(V)$ sends X, Y, v, w to

$$gXg^{-1}, \quad gYg^{-1}, \quad gv, \quad wg^{-1}\,. \tag{3.26}$$

This action is free when λ is regular, and its orbits are identified with the points of the Calogero–Moser space $\mathcal{C}_{\alpha,\lambda}$, whose dimension of which is given by Prop. 3.1. In our case the set of vertices of Q is $I \sqcup \{\infty\}$ and the dimension vector is $\boldsymbol{\alpha} = (1, \alpha)$. We have

$$p(\boldsymbol{\alpha}) = 1 + \sum_{i\in I} \alpha_i\alpha_{i+1} + \sum_{i\in I} \alpha_i - 1 - \sum_{i\in I} \alpha_i^2 = \sum_{i\in I} \alpha_i - \frac{1}{2}\sum_{i\in I} (\alpha_i - \alpha_{i+1})^2 .$$

Therefore,

$$\dim \mathcal{C}_{\alpha,\lambda} = 2\sum_{i\in I} \alpha_i - \sum_{i\in I} (\alpha_i - \alpha_{i+1})^2 . \tag{3.27}$$

In the case of quiver (3.15) everything looks similar except that we only have one pair v_ℓ, w_ℓ, therefore we may just put $v_i = w_i = 0$ for $i \neq \ell$. This turns equations (3.21)–(3.22) into

$$Y_iX_i - X_{i-1}Y_{i-1} - \delta_{i,\ell} v_\ell w_\ell = \lambda_i 1_{V_i} \qquad (i \in \mathbb{Z}/m\mathbb{Z}), \tag{3.28}$$

$$w_\ell v_\ell = \lambda_\infty . \tag{3.29}$$

The relation (3.24) becomes

$$YX - XY - v_\ell w_\ell = \sum_{i\in I} \lambda_i e_i \tag{3.30}$$

and (3.25), (3.26) remain the same but with $v_i = w_i = 0$ for $i \neq \ell$. Since in this case Q has only one arrow going to ∞, we find that

$$\dim \mathcal{C}_{\alpha,\lambda} = 2\alpha_\ell - \sum_{i\in I} (\alpha_i - \alpha_{i+1})^2 , \tag{3.31}$$

assuming that $(1, \alpha)$ is a positive root for Q and λ is regular.

4. Rational solutions via Calogero–Moser spaces

In this section we construct rational solutions of the hierarchy, parametrised by points of the suitable Calogero–Moser spaces. We start by setting up the notation and doing some preliminary calculations.

4.1. **Preliminary calculations.** Let Q be the quiver (3.14) and $\mathcal{C}_{\alpha,\lambda}$ be the space (3.17). Take a point of $\mathcal{C}_{\alpha,\lambda}$; it is represented by (isomorphism class of) data X, Y, v, w satisfying (3.24)–(3.25). Put

$$M = 1 - \sum_{i,j\in I} \epsilon_i w_i (X - x1_V)^{-1} (Y - y1_V)^{-1} v_j \epsilon_j . \tag{4.1}$$

Here we regard $(X - x1_V)^{-1}$ and $(Y - y1_V)^{-1}$ as elements of the tensor product $\mathcal{P} \otimes \operatorname{End} V$ by expanding $(y1_V - Y)^{-1}$ into $\sum_{k\geqslant 0} Y^k y^{-k-1}$. Similarly, e_i, ϵ_i are identified with the elements $1 \otimes e_i$ and $\epsilon_i \otimes 1_V$, so that $e_i\epsilon_i = \epsilon_i e_i = \epsilon_i \otimes e_i$, while v_i and w_i become maps between $\mathcal{P} \otimes V$ and $\mathcal{P}$. Therefore M is an element of $\mathcal{P}$. It is clear that M is invariant under transformations (3.26). Thus, (4.1) defines a map $\mathcal{C}_{\alpha,\lambda} \to 1 + \mathcal{P}_-$.

Lemma 4.1. *The inverse of M is given by*

$$M^{-1} = 1 + \sum_{i,j\in I} \epsilon_i w_i (Y - y1_V)^{-1} (X - x1_V)^{-1} v_j \epsilon_j . \tag{4.2}$$

Proof. We need to check that $M^{-1}M = 1$. Introduce the following shorthand notation:

$$\widehat{X} = X - x1_V\,, \quad \widehat{Y} = Y - y1_V\,.$$

It easily follows from (2.5), (3.24) that

$$\sum_{i\in I} v_i w_i = \widehat{Y}\widehat{X} - \widehat{X}\widehat{Y} + \sum_{i\in I}\lambda_i(\epsilon_i - e_i)\,. \tag{4.3}$$

Next, note the following identities:

$$e_a\epsilon_b\widehat{X}^{-1}\widehat{Y}^{-1}e_c\epsilon_d = 0\,, \qquad \text{if } a-c\neq b-d\,, \tag{4.4}$$

$$e_a\epsilon_a\widehat{X}^{-1}\widehat{Y}^{-1}e_c\epsilon_c = \epsilon_a e_a\widehat{X}^{-1}\widehat{Y}^{-1}e_c\,, \quad e_c\epsilon_c\widehat{X}^{-1}\widehat{Y}^{-1}e_a\epsilon_a = e_c\widehat{X}^{-1}\widehat{Y}^{-1}e_a\epsilon_a\,, \tag{4.5}$$

$$e_a\epsilon_a\widehat{X}^{-1}\widehat{Y}^{-1}(\epsilon_c - e_c) = 0\,, \qquad (\epsilon_c - e_c)\widehat{X}^{-1}\widehat{Y}^{-1}e_a\epsilon_a = 0\,. \tag{4.6}$$

Here $a,b,c,d\in I = \mathbb{Z}/m\mathbb{Z}$. To prove (4.4), note that

$$e_a\epsilon_b\widehat{X}^{-1}\widehat{Y}^{-1}e_c\epsilon_d = \sum_{i,j\geqslant 0} e_a\epsilon_b X^i Y^j x^{-1-i}y^{-1-j}e_c\epsilon_d$$
$$= \sum_{i,j\geqslant 0} e_a\epsilon_b e_{c+i-j}\epsilon_{d+i-j}X^iY^jx^{-1-i}y^{-1-j}\,,$$

which is obviously zero if $a-c\neq b-d$ (here we used (2.4) and (3.25)). Formula (4.5) follows from (4.4) by substituting $e_c = \sum_{i\in I} e_c\epsilon_i$ to the right hand side of (4.5). Finally, to derive (4.6) one replaces $\epsilon_c - e_c$ by $\sum_{i\in I}(e_i\epsilon_c - e_c\epsilon_i)$ and uses (4.4).

Below we will repeatedly use the following corollary of (4.5):

$$\epsilon_k w_k\widehat{X}^{-1}\widehat{Y}^{-1}v_j\epsilon_j = w_k\widehat{X}^{-1}\widehat{Y}^{-1}v_j\epsilon_j = \epsilon_k w_k\widehat{X}^{-1}\widehat{Y}^{-1}v_j\,. \tag{4.7}$$

In other words, one can remove either ϵ_k or ϵ_j in this expression.

Now, using the formulas for M, M^{-1} we get:

$$M^{-1}M = 1 - \sum_{i,j}\epsilon_i w_i\widehat{X}^{-1}\widehat{Y}^{-1}v_j\epsilon_j + \sum_{i,j}\epsilon_i w_i\widehat{Y}^{-1}\widehat{X}^{-1}v_j\epsilon_j$$
$$- \sum_{i,j,k}\epsilon_i w_i\widehat{Y}^{-1}\widehat{X}^{-1}v_k\epsilon_k w_k\widehat{X}^{-1}\widehat{Y}^{-1}v_j\epsilon_j\,. \tag{4.8}$$

We can use (4.7) and replace the last sum by

$$\sum_{i,j}\epsilon_i w_i\widehat{Y}^{-1}\widehat{X}^{-1}\Big(\sum_k v_k w_k\Big)\widehat{X}^{-1}\widehat{Y}^{-1}v_j\epsilon_j\,. \tag{4.9}$$

Replacing $\sum_k v_k w_k$ by (4.3) and substituting back in (4.8), we obtain

$$M^{-1}M = 1 - \sum_{i,j,k\in I}\lambda_k\epsilon_i w_i\widehat{Y}^{-1}\widehat{X}^{-1}(\epsilon_k - e_k)\widehat{X}^{-1}\widehat{Y}^{-1}v_j\epsilon_j\,.$$

By (4.6),

$$(\epsilon_k - e_k)\widehat{X}^{-1}\widehat{Y}^{-1}v_j\epsilon_j = (\epsilon_k - e_k)\widehat{X}^{-1}\widehat{Y}^{-1}e_j\epsilon_j v_j = 0\,.$$

We conclude that $M^{-1}M = 1$, as needed. □

Lemma 4.2. *Let $L = MyM^{-1}$. For $k \in \mathbb{N}$, we have*

$$(L^k)_- = \sum_{i,j} \epsilon_i w_{i-k} Y^k \widehat{Y}^{-1} \widehat{X}^{-1} v_j \epsilon_j - \sum_{i,j} \epsilon_i w_i \widehat{X}^{-1} \widehat{Y}^{-1} Y^k v_{j+k} \epsilon_j$$
$$- \sum_{i,j,\ell} \epsilon_i w_i \widehat{X}^{-1} \widehat{Y}^{-1} Y^k v_\ell w_{\ell-k} \widehat{Y}^{-1} \widehat{X}^{-1} v_j \epsilon_j$$
$$+ \sum_{i,j,\ell} \sum_{a=0}^{k-1} \epsilon_i w_i \widehat{X}^{-1} Y^a v_\ell w_{\ell-k} Y^{k-1-a} \widehat{Y}^{-1} \widehat{X}^{-1} v_j \epsilon_j \,. \quad (4.10)$$

Proof. Write M, M^{-1} as

$$M = 1 - \sum_{i,j} \mu_{ij} \,, \quad M^{-1} = 1 + \sum_{i,j} \tilde{\mu}_{ij} \,,$$

where

$$\mu_{ij} = \epsilon_i w_i \widehat{X}^{-1} \widehat{Y}^{-1} v_j \epsilon_j \,, \quad \tilde{\mu}_{ij} = \epsilon_i w_i \widehat{Y}^{-1} \widehat{X}^{-1} v_j \epsilon_j \,.$$

Therefore,

$$L^k = My^k M^{-1} = y^k + \sum_{i,j} y^k \tilde{\mu}_{ij} - \sum_{i,j} \mu_{ij} y^k - \sum_{iji'j'} \mu_{ij} y^k \tilde{\mu}_{i'j'} \,. \quad (4.11)$$

Taking into account that $\epsilon_j y^k = y^k \epsilon_{j-k}$, one gets

$$\sum_{i,j} y^k \tilde{\mu}_{ij} = \sum_{i,j} \epsilon_i w_{i-k} y^k \widehat{Y}^{-1} \widehat{X}^{-1} v_j \epsilon_j \,, \quad (4.12)$$

$$- \sum_{i,j} \mu_{ij} y^k = - \sum_{i,j} \epsilon_i w_i \widehat{X}^{-1} \widehat{Y}^{-1} y^k v_{j+k} \epsilon_j \,, \quad (4.13)$$

$$- \sum_{i,j,i',j'} \mu_{ij} y^k \tilde{\mu}_{i'j'} = - \sum_{i,j,\ell} \epsilon_i w_i \widehat{X}^{-1} \widehat{Y}^{-1} \epsilon_\ell v_\ell y^k w_{\ell-k} \widehat{Y}^{-1} \widehat{X}^{-1} v_j \epsilon_j \,. \quad (4.14)$$

By (4.7), we can remove ϵ_ℓ in the last formula to get

$$- \sum_{i,j,i',j'} \mu_{ij} y^k \tilde{\mu}_{i'j'} = - \sum_{i,j,\ell} \epsilon_i w_i \widehat{X}^{-1} \widehat{Y}^{-1} y^k v_\ell w_{\ell-k} \widehat{Y}^{-1} \widehat{X}^{-1} v_j \epsilon_j \,.$$

From an elementary formula $Y^k - y^k 1_V = (Y - y1_V) \sum_{a=0}^{k-1} y^{k-1-a} Y^a$ we obtain:

$$y^k \widehat{Y}^{-1} = \widehat{Y}^{-1} y^k = \widehat{Y}^{-1} Y^k - \sum_{a=0}^{k-1} Y^a y^{k-1-a} \,, \qquad (y^k \widehat{Y}^{-1})_- = Y^k \widehat{Y}^{-1} \,. \quad (4.15)$$

Similarly,

$$\widehat{Y}^{-1} y^k v_\ell w_{\ell-k} \widehat{Y}^{-1} = \widehat{Y}^{-1} Y^k v_\ell w_{\ell-k} \widehat{Y}^{-1} - \sum_{a=0}^{k-1} Y^a v_\ell w_{\ell-k} y^{k-1-a} \widehat{Y}^{-1} \,,$$

and by applying the formula (4.15) we obtain

$$(\widehat{Y}^{-1} y^k v_\ell w_{\ell-k} \widehat{Y}^{-1})_- = \widehat{Y}^{-1} Y^k v_\ell w_{\ell-k} \widehat{Y}^{-1} - \sum_{a=0}^{k-1} Y^a v_\ell w_{\ell-k} Y^{k-1-a} \widehat{Y}^{-1} \,.$$

Using these facts, we compute the negative part of (4.12)–(4.14) which results in (4.10). □

4.2. **Solutions for the hierarchy.** Let Q be the quiver (3.14) and $\boldsymbol{\alpha} = (1, \alpha)$ with $\alpha \in \mathbb{N}_0^I$. Consider $\mathtt{Rep}(\mathbb{C}\overline{Q}^{\mathrm{opp}}, \boldsymbol{\alpha})$; a point of $\mathtt{Rep}(\mathbb{C}\overline{Q}^{\mathrm{opp}}, \boldsymbol{\alpha})$ is a collection of maps

$$X_i \colon V_i \to V_{i+1}\,, \qquad Y_i \colon V_{i+1} \to V_i\,, \qquad v_i \colon \mathbb{C} \to V_i\,, \qquad w_i \colon V_i \to \mathbb{C}\,.$$

Thus, this is an affine space of dimension $2\sum_{i\in I}(\alpha_i\alpha_{i+1} + \alpha_i)$. It has a natural symplectic structure (3.5),

$$\omega = \sum_{i\in I} \left(\mathrm{tr}(\mathrm{d}Y_i \wedge \mathrm{d}X_i) + \mathrm{d}w_i \wedge \mathrm{d}v_i\right)\,. \tag{4.16}$$

The corresponding Poisson bracket is given by

$$\big\{(X_i)_{ab}, (Y_j)_{cd}\big\} = \delta_{ij}\delta_{ad}\delta_{bc}\,, \qquad \big\{(v_i)_a, (w_j)_b\big\} = \delta_{ij}\delta_{ab}\,. \tag{4.17}$$

(All remaining brackets are zero.)

As before, we will combine X_i, Y_j, v_i, w_i into $X, Y \in \mathrm{End}V$ and $v \colon \mathbb{C} \to V$, $w \colon \mathbb{C} \to V$, see (3.23). For $k \in \mathbb{N}$, define a flow on $\mathtt{Rep}(\mathbb{C}\overline{Q}^{\mathrm{opp}}, \boldsymbol{\alpha})$ by the formulas

$$\dot{X} = -\sum_{\ell\in I}\sum_{a=0}^{k-1} Y^a v_\ell w_{\ell-k} Y^{k-a-1}\,, \qquad \dot{Y} = 0\,, \tag{4.18}$$

$$\dot{v} = -Y^k v\,, \qquad \dot{w} = wY^k\,, \tag{4.19}$$

where the dot denotes the derivative with respect to the time variable t_k. Equivalently,

$$\dot{X}_i = -\sum_{a=0}^{k-1} Y_{i+1}Y_{i+2}\cdots Y_{i+a}v_{i+a+1}w_{i+a+1-k}Y_{i+a+1-k}\cdots Y_{i-1}\,, \tag{4.20}$$

$$\dot{Y}_i = 0\,, \tag{4.21}$$

$$\dot{v}_i = -Y^k v_{i+k} = -Y_iY_{i+1}\cdots Y_{i+k-1}v_{i+k}\,, \tag{4.22}$$

$$\dot{w}_i = w_{i-k}Y^k = w_{i-k}Y_{i-k}Y_{i-k+1}\cdots Y_{i-1}\,. \tag{4.23}$$

It is easy to check that this is a Hamiltonian flow, with the Hamiltonian

$$H_k = -wY^k v = -\sum_{i\in I} w_i Y_i \ldots Y_{i+k-1}v_{i+k}\,. \tag{4.24}$$

The Hamiltonian H_k is invariant under the action (3.26) of $G(\boldsymbol{\alpha})$, therefore, the moment map is a first integral, thus the flow descends to a Hamiltonian flow on a symplectic quotient $\mathcal{C}_{\alpha,\lambda}$. (This can also be checked directly by differentiating the relations (3.21)–(3.22).)

Proposition 4.3. *Let $L = MyM^{-1}$ where M, M^{-1} are as in* (4.1) *and* (4.2)*. If X, Y, v, w satisfy the equations* (4.18)–(4.19)*, then L satisfies $\dot{L} = [(L^k)_+, L]$.*

Proof. According to Prop. 2.6, it suffices to check that

$$\dot{M} = -(L^k)_- M. \tag{4.25}$$

Let us start by calculating the right-hand side. Note that the second and third sum in (4.10) are nothing but

$$\Big(-\sum_{i,j} \epsilon_i w_i \widehat{X}^{-1}\widehat{Y}^{-1}Y^k v_{j+k}\epsilon_j\Big)M^{-1}\,.$$

Therefore, substituting them in the right-hand side of (4.25) results in

$$\sum_{i,j} \epsilon_i w_i \widehat{X}^{-1}\widehat{Y}^{-1}Y^k v_{j+k}\epsilon_j\,. \tag{4.26}$$

Multiplying the remaining terms in (4.10) by M gives:

$$\begin{aligned}\Big(\sum_{i,j} \epsilon_i w_{i-k} Y^k \widehat{Y}^{-1}\widehat{X}^{-1} v_j\epsilon_j + \sum_{i,j,\ell}\sum_{a=0}^{k-1} \epsilon_i w_i \widehat{X}^{-1} Y^a v_\ell w_{\ell-k} Y^{k-1-a}\widehat{Y}^{-1}\widehat{X}^{-1} v_j\epsilon_j\Big) M \\ = \sum_{i,j} \epsilon_i w_{i-k} Y^k \widehat{Y}^{-1}\widehat{X}^{-1} v_j\epsilon_j + \sum_{i,j,\ell}\sum_{a=0}^{k-1} \epsilon_i w_i \widehat{X}^{-1} Y^a v_\ell w_{\ell-k} Y^{k-1-a}\widehat{Y}^{-1}\widehat{X}^{-1} v_j\epsilon_j \\ - \sum_{i,j,r} \epsilon_i w_{i-k} Y^k \widehat{Y}^{-1}\widehat{X}^{-1} v_r w_r \widehat{X}^{-1}\widehat{Y}^{-1} v_j\epsilon_j \\ - \sum_{i,j,\ell,r}\sum_{a=0}^{k-1} \epsilon_i w_i \widehat{X}^{-1} Y^a v_\ell w_{\ell-k} Y^{k-1-a}\widehat{Y}^{-1}\widehat{X}^{-1} v_r w_r \widehat{X}^{-1}\widehat{Y}^{-1} v_j\epsilon_j\,.\end{aligned} \tag{4.27}$$

Replacing $\sum_r v_r w_r$ in the last two terms by (4.3) and applying (4.6) and (4.7), we are left after cancellations with the following terms:

$$\sum_{i,j} \epsilon_i w_{i-k} Y^k \widehat{X}^{-1}\widehat{Y}^{-1} v_j\epsilon_j + \sum_{i,j,\ell}\sum_{a=0}^{k-1} \epsilon_i w_i \widehat{X}^{-1} Y^a v_\ell w_{\ell-k} Y^{k-1-a}\widehat{X}^{-1}\widehat{Y}^{-1} v_j\epsilon_j\,. \tag{4.28}$$

Now, the right-hand side of (4.25) is obtained by subtracting (4.28) from (4.26), so

$$\begin{aligned}-(L^k)_- M = \sum_{i,j} \epsilon_i w_i \widehat{X}^{-1}\widehat{Y}^{-1} Y^k v_{j+k}\epsilon_j - \sum_{i,j} \epsilon_i w_{i-k} Y^k \widehat{X}^{-1}\widehat{Y}^{-1} v_j\epsilon_j \\ - \sum_{i,j,\ell}\sum_{a=0}^{k-1} \epsilon_i w_i \widehat{X}^{-1} Y^a v_\ell w_{\ell-k} Y^{k-1-a}\widehat{X}^{-1}\widehat{Y}^{-1} v_j\epsilon_j\,.\end{aligned} \tag{4.29}$$

On the other hand, from the formula for M we get that

$$\dot{M} = -\sum_{i,j} \epsilon_i w_i \widehat{X}^{-1}\widehat{Y}^{-1}\dot{v}_j\epsilon_j - \sum_{i,j} \epsilon_i \dot{w}_i \widehat{X}^{-1}\widehat{Y}^{-1} v_j\epsilon_j + \sum_{i,j} \epsilon_i w_i \widehat{X}^{-1}\dot{\widehat{X}}\widehat{X}^{-1}\widehat{Y}^{-1} v_j\epsilon_j\,.$$

Now a quick look at (4.29) and (4.18), (4.22), (4.23) confirms that $\dot{M} = -(L^k)_- M$, as needed. □

With the flow (4.18)–(4.19) on $\mathcal{C}_{\alpha,\lambda}$ corresponding to the k-th flow of the hierarchy, we obtain a commuting family of Hamiltonian flows on $\mathcal{C}_{\alpha,\lambda}$ labelled by k. In fact, one can confirm by a direct calculation that the Hamiltonians (4.24) commute, that is,

$$\{H_j, H_k\} = 0 \qquad \text{for all } j,k\,. \tag{4.30}$$

Thus, we arrive at the following result.

Theorem 4.4. *Under the map $\mathcal{C}_{\alpha,\lambda} \to \mathcal{P}$ which sends (X,Y,v,w) to $L = MyM^{-1}$, the commuting flows with the Hamiltonians H_k, $k = 1,2,\dots$, get identified with the flows of the hierarchy* (2.18).

□

Let us integrate the flows (4.18)–(4.19) simultaneously for all k. First we integrate (4.19) to find that

$$v = e^{-\sum_k t_k Y^k} v(0)\,, \quad w = w(0) e^{\sum_k t_k Y^k}\,, \quad vw = e^{-\sum_k t_k \mathrm{ad}_{Y^k}}\big(v(0)w(0)\big)\,, \tag{4.31}$$

where $Y = Y(0)$ is constant and we use the standard notation for $\mathrm{ad}_A B = AB - BA$. Next, note that (4.18) can be written as

$$\frac{\partial X}{\partial t_k} = -\sum_{i\in I} e_{i+1}\Big(\sum_{a=0}^{k-1} Y^a vw Y^{k-1-a}\Big)e_i = -\sum_{i\in I} e_{i+1}(\mathrm{ad}_Y)^{-1}\mathrm{ad}_{Y^k}(vw)e_i\,.$$

Substituting the expression for vw and integrating, we find that

$$X = X(0) + \sum_{i\in I} e_{i+1}\left\{(\mathrm{ad}_Y)^{-1}\big(e^{-\sum_k t_k \mathrm{ad}_{Y^k}} - 1\big)\big(v(0)w(0)\big)\right\}e_i\,. \tag{4.32}$$

Note that $(\mathrm{ad}_Y)^{-1}(e^{-\sum_k t_k \mathrm{ad}_{Y^k}} - 1)$ is well defined: after expanding the exponential into a series each term contains a well-defined factor $(\mathrm{ad}_Y)^{-1}\mathrm{ad}_{Y^k}$.

Let us remark on the flows with $k = mj$, $j \in \mathbb{N}$. In this case

$$H_{mj} = -wY^{mj}v = -\sum_{i\in I} w_i Y^{mj} v_i = -\mathrm{tr}\big(Y^{mj}\sum_i v_i w_i\big)\,.$$

On $\mathcal{C}_{\alpha,\lambda}$ (3.24) holds, so H_{mj} can be replaced by

$$\widetilde{H}_{mj} = \mathrm{tr}\left(Y^{mj}\Big(XY - YX + \sum_{i\in I}\lambda_i e_i\Big)\right) = \sum_{i\in I}\lambda_i \mathrm{tr}(e_i Y^{mj} e_i) = \frac{|\lambda|}{m}\,\mathrm{tr}Y^{mj}\,, \tag{4.33}$$

where $|\lambda| := \sum_{i\in I}\lambda_i$. According to (2.5), $|\lambda| = -m\tau \neq 0$. Therefore, the flow (4.18)–(4.19) can be replaced by

$$\dot{X} = j|\lambda|Y^{mj-1}\,, \qquad \dot{Y} = 0\,, \tag{4.34}$$

$$\dot{v} = 0\,, \qquad \dot{w} = 0\,. \tag{4.35}$$

As a result, the mj-th flow is linear: $X(t_{mj}) = X(0) + j|\lambda|t_{mj}Y^{mj-1}$.

4.3. **Solutions for the spherical sub-hierarchy.** Given $\ell \in I$, consider the quiver (3.15) and let $\mathcal{C}_{\alpha,\lambda}$ be a Calogero–Moser space (3.17). Recall that the description of $\mathcal{C}_{\alpha,\lambda}$ is almost the same as for the quiver (3.14), see (3.28)–(3.30), the only difference being that $v_i = w_i = 0$ for $i \neq \ell$. Therefore, in this case $v = v_\ell$, $w = w_\ell$ and we simply need to make appropriate changes in the previous formulas.

Hence, given a point (X, Y, v, w) of $\mathcal{C}_{\alpha,\lambda}$, we put

$$M = 1 - \epsilon_\ell w_\ell (X - x1_V)^{-1}(Y - y1_V)^{-1}v_\ell\epsilon_\ell\,. \tag{4.36}$$

This defines a map $\mathcal{C}_{\alpha,\lambda} \to 1 + \mathcal{P}_-$. By Lemma 4.1, the inverse of M is given by

$$M^{-1} = 1 + \epsilon_\ell w_\ell (Y - y1_V)^{-1}(X - x1_V)^{-1}v_\ell\epsilon_\ell\,. \tag{4.37}$$

It is obvious from these formulas that $\epsilon_i M = M\epsilon_i$ and $\epsilon_i M^{-1} = M^{-1}\epsilon_i$ for $i \in I$. Hence, $L = MyM^{-1}$ and $\widetilde{L} = L^m = My^mM^{-1}$ will satisfy

$$\epsilon_i L = L\epsilon_{i-1}\,, \qquad \epsilon_i\widetilde{L} = \widetilde{L}\epsilon_i\,.$$

Now, using (X, Y, v, w) as the initial data, we can construct a solution to the spherical sub-hierarchy. As explained above, when restricting to the flows with $k = mj$, the dependence of (X, Y, v, w) on $t = (t_m, t_{2m}, \dots)$ reduces to

$$X(t) = X(0) + |\lambda| \sum_{j \geqslant 1} j t_{mj} Y^{mj-1}, \quad Y = Y(0), \quad v = v(0), \quad w = w(0). \quad (4.38)$$

Clearly, the condition $v_i = w_i = 0$ for $i \neq \ell$ remains valid for all times. As a result, the corresponding $L(t)$, $\widetilde{L}(t)$ and $\widetilde{L}_\ell(t) = \epsilon_\ell \widetilde{L}(t)$ will satisfy the equations (2.24), (2.25) and (2.27).

Remark 4.5. Up to a change of notation, the element M defined in (4.36) is the same as κ in [Esh, Theorem 2.6]; interpreting it as a "pseudo-differential operator" in a suitable sense was the starting point in our work.

Remark 4.6. The Calogero–Moser spaces (3.17) associated with the quivers (3.14)–(3.15) are particular cases of the quiver varieties that appear in [BGK1, BGK2]. Namely, they correspond to setting the Γ-module W in [BGK2, (2.16)] as $W = \mathbb{C}\Gamma$ and $W = \mathbb{C}\epsilon_\ell$, respectively, where $\mathbb{C}\epsilon_\ell$ is viewed as a one-dimensional Γ-module. Similarly, the Calogero–Moser spaces for the quivers (3.12)–(3.13) correspond to $W = \mathbb{C}\Gamma^{\oplus d}$ and $W = (\mathbb{C}\epsilon_\ell)^{\oplus d}$.

Remark 4.7. Above we assumed that λ is regular, which puts restrictions (3.19) on parameters $k_0, \dots, k_{m-1}$ for the Cherednik algebra $H_{\tau,k}$. Let us remark on the situation in general, for arbitrary k_i and $\tau \neq 0$. In this case one may have reducible representations in $\mathtt{Rep}(\Pi^{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}, \boldsymbol{\alpha})$. Non semi-simple representations are irrelevant because they are indistinguishable from semi-simple ones under the map $(X, Y, v, w) \mapsto M$. On the other hand, if (X, Y, v, w) describes a semi-simple reducible $\Pi^{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}$-module, then it is a direct sum of simples, exactly one of which must contain $V_\infty = \mathbb{C}$. The formula (4.1) makes it clear that M is fully determined by this simple summand. Let $\boldsymbol{\alpha}' = (1, \alpha')$ be the dimension vector of this summand, so it corresponds to some point $(X', Y', v', w') \in \mathtt{Rep}(\Pi^{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}, \boldsymbol{\alpha}')$. Then the two solutions of the hierarchy built from (X, Y, v, w) and (X', Y', v', w') coincide. Therefore, the solutions of the hierarchy are parametrised by the locus of simple representations:

$$\bigsqcup_{\boldsymbol{\alpha}=(1,\alpha)} \mathtt{Irr}(\Pi^{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}, \boldsymbol{\alpha}) /\!/ \mathtt{GL}(\alpha).$$

For a description of the set $\Sigma_\lambda \subset \Delta_+(Q)$ of all $\boldsymbol{\alpha}$ such that $\mathtt{Irr}(\Pi^{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}, \boldsymbol{\alpha}) \neq \emptyset$, see Theorem 1.2 of [CB2].

Remark 4.8. The family of commuting Hamiltonians (4.24) can be generalised to any quiver Q_0 with a vertex set I. Namely, suppose Q is obtained from Q_0 by adding a vertex ∞ and one arrow $v_i \colon \infty \to i$ for every $i \in I$. For $k \in \mathbb{N}$, let $h_k = \sum_{i,j \in I} v_j^* a_k \dots a_1 v_i \in \mathbb{C}[\overline{Q}]$, where the sum is taken over all paths $a_k \dots a_1$ length k in Q_0. It is a pleasant exercise to check that $[h_k, h_l]_{NL} = 0$, where $[\cdot, \cdot]_{NL}$ denotes the necklace Lie bracket [BLB]. According to the general principle [VdB, CB4], for any representation $\rho \in \mathtt{Rep}(\mathbb{C}\overline{Q}, \alpha)$ the functions $H_k = \mathrm{tr}\rho(h_k)$ Poisson-commute both on $\mathtt{Rep}(\mathbb{C}\overline{Q}, \alpha)$ and on the symplectic quotients $\mathtt{Rep}(\Pi^\lambda, \alpha) /\!/ G(\boldsymbol{\alpha})$.

5. Link to the Calogero–Moser system

In this section we explain how the dynamics (4.18)–(4.19) is related to the classical Calogero–Moser system for the wreath-product $\mathbb{Z}_m \wr S_n$. For this purpose,

we will make the special choice $\boldsymbol{\alpha} = (1, n\delta)$ where $\delta = (1, \dots, 1)$. Consider the varieties $\mathcal{C}_{n\delta,\lambda}$ which will be abbreviated to $\mathcal{C}_{n,\lambda}$ for simplicity. Everything still depends on the choice of framing, so we have two versions of $\mathcal{C}_{n,\lambda}$, corresponding to quivers (3.14), (3.15). We will deal first with the case (3.15).

Let Γ denote, as previously, the cyclic group of order m with a generator s acting on $\mathbb{C}$ by a fixed primitive mth root of unity, μ. The group Γ^n acts naturally on $\mathfrak{h} := \mathbb{C}^n$. The wreath product $G = \Gamma \wr S_n$ is, by definition, the semidirect product $S_n \ltimes \Gamma^n$, where S_n acts in the obvious way on $\mathfrak{h}$ by permuting the coordinates. Write s_{ij} for the elementary transpositions in S_n, and s_i for a copy of $s \in \Gamma$ placed in the ith factor in Γ^n. The group G is generated by all s_{ij} and s_i. This is the group $G(m, 1, n)$ in the standard classification of complex reflection groups [ST]; in the case $m = 2$ it is the Coxeter group of type B_n.

5.1. **Darboux coordinates on $\mathcal{C}_{n,\lambda}$.** Consider the quiver (3.15), where we set $\ell = 0$ for simplicity. From the formula (3.31), we find that $\dim \mathcal{C}_{n,\lambda} = 2n$. Points of $\mathcal{C}_{n,\lambda}$ are represented by linear maps

$$X_i \colon V_i \to V_{i+1}\,, \qquad Y_i \colon V_{i+1} \to V_i\,, \qquad v_0 \colon \mathbb{C} \to V_0\,, \qquad w_0 \colon V_0 \to \mathbb{C}\,,$$

where $\dim V_i = n$. These maps should satisfy the relations (3.28):

$$Y_i X_i - X_{i-1} Y_{i-1} - \delta_{i0} v_0 w_0 = \lambda_i 1_{V_i} \qquad (i \in \mathbb{Z}/m\mathbb{Z})\,. \tag{5.1}$$

To construct local coordinates on $\mathcal{C}_{n,\lambda}$, we look at the subset $\mathcal{C}'_{n,\lambda} \subset \mathcal{C}_{n,\lambda}$ where the transformation $X_{m-1} \dots X_1 X_0 \in \mathrm{End}(V_0)$ is diagonalisable and invertible. Suppose that this transformation has eigenvalues $\nu_1^m, \dots, \nu_n^m$. Then one can choose bases in each of V_i so that all X_i look identical:

$$X_i = \mathrm{diag}(\nu_1, \dots, \nu_n)\,. \tag{5.2}$$

Then from (5.1) we obtain that

$$(Y_i)_{jj}\nu_j - \nu_j (Y_{i-1})_{jj} - \delta_{i0}(v_0 w_0)_{jj} = \lambda_i\,, \tag{5.3}$$

$$(Y_i)_{jk}\nu_k - \nu_j (Y_{i-1})_{jk} - \delta_{i0}(v_0 w_0)_{jk} = 0 \qquad (j \neq k)\,. \tag{5.4}$$

Summing (5.3) over i we obtain that for any j,

$$(v_0 w_0)_{jj} = -|\lambda|\,, \qquad \text{where} \quad |\lambda| = \sum_{i \in I} \lambda_i \neq 0\,.$$

Therefore, by rescaling the bases in each of V_i we may achieve that

$$(v_0)_j = 1\,, \quad (w_0)_j = -|\lambda|\,, \quad \text{and therefore } (v_0 w_0)_{jk} = -|\lambda| \text{ for all } j, k\,. \tag{5.5}$$

The matrices Y_i are then easily determined from relations (5.3)–(5.4). Namely, we must have $\nu_j^m \neq \nu_k^m$ for $j \neq k$, and the matrices Y_i can be chosen in the following form:

$$(Y_i)_{jj} = \mu_j + \frac{1}{\nu_j}(a + \sum_{r=0}^{i} \lambda_r)\,, \qquad a = -\sum_{r=0}^{m-1} \frac{m-r}{m} \lambda_r\,, \tag{5.6}$$

$$(Y_i)_{jk} = |\lambda| \, \frac{\nu_j^i \nu_k^{m-i-1}}{\nu_j^m - \nu_k^m} \qquad (j \neq k)\,, \tag{5.7}$$

where $i = 0, 1, \dots, m-1$. Here $\mu_1, \dots, \mu_n$ are arbitrary, so $\{\mu_j, \nu_j\}$ are local coordinates on $\mathcal{C}'_{n,\lambda}$.

Note that the set of eigenvalues $\{\nu_1^m, \dots, \nu_n^m\}$ determines $\nu_1, \dots, \nu_n$ only up to permutations and multiplication by mth roots of unity. As a result, the coordinates ν_j, μ_j on $\mathcal{C}'_{n,\lambda}$ are defined up to the action of $G = S_n \ltimes \Gamma^n \subset \mathtt{GL}(n, \mathbb{C})$ that simultaneously permutes $\{\nu_j\}$, $\{\mu_j\}$ and replaces ν_j, μ_j by $\mu^{r_j}\nu_j$, $\mu^{-r_j}\mu_j$. This action comes from the G-action on $\mathtt{Rep}\big((\Pi^{\boldsymbol{\lambda}})^{\mathrm{opp}}, \boldsymbol{\alpha}\big)$ via the embedding $G \hookrightarrow \mathtt{GL}(\alpha) = \mathtt{GL}(n, \mathbb{C})^m$ given by

$$\sigma \mapsto (\sigma, \dots, \sigma)\,, \qquad\qquad s_1^{r_1} \cdots s_n^{r_n} \mapsto (1, F, \dots, F^{m-1}), \tag{5.8}$$

where $\sigma \in S_n$ and $F = \mathrm{diag}(\mu^{r_1}, \dots, \mu^{r_n})$.

It follows that $\mathcal{C}'_{n,\lambda}$ is isomorphic to $\mathfrak{h}_{reg} \times \mathfrak{h}^*/G$, where

$$\mathfrak{h}_{reg} := \big\{x \in \mathfrak{h} \mid \prod_{i=1}^n x_i \prod_{i<j}(x_i^m - x_j^m) \neq 0\big\}\,. \tag{5.9}$$

Recall that $\mathcal{C}_{n,\lambda}$ inherits a symplectic structure from the standard symplectic structure on the space $\mathtt{Rep}\big(\mathbb{C}\overline{Q}^{\mathrm{opp}}, \boldsymbol{\alpha}\big)$,

$$\omega = \sum_{i \in I} \mathrm{tr}(\mathrm{d}Y_i \wedge \mathrm{d}X_i) + \mathrm{d}w_0 \wedge \mathrm{d}v_0\,. \tag{5.10}$$

Denote this symplectic structure as $\omega_{\mathcal{C}_{n,\lambda}}$.

Proposition 5.1. *The above coordinates $\{\mu_i, \nu_i\}$ are Darboux coordinates in the sense that*

$$\omega_{\mathcal{C}_{n,\lambda}} = m \sum_{i=1}^n \mathrm{d}\mu_i \wedge \mathrm{d}\nu_i\,.$$

Proof. Recall that $\mathcal{C}_{n,\lambda}$ is obtained from $\mathtt{Rep}(\mathbb{C}Q^{\mathrm{opp}}, \boldsymbol{\alpha})$ by Hamiltonian reduction, see (3.6). Using the coordinates $\{\mu_i, \nu_i\}$ we identify $\mathcal{C}'_{n,\lambda}$ locally with an open subset in $\mathfrak{h}_{reg} \times \mathfrak{h}^*$. Consider the mapping $\phi\colon \mathfrak{h}_{reg} \times \mathfrak{h}^* \to \mathtt{Rep}(\mathbb{C}\overline{Q}^{\mathrm{opp}}, \boldsymbol{\alpha})$, defined by the formulas (5.2) and (5.5)–(5.7). Locally, this represents a transversal slice for the action of $\mathtt{GL}(n\delta) = \mathtt{GL}(n, \mathbb{C})^m$ on $\mathtt{Rep}\big((\Pi^{\boldsymbol{\lambda}})^{\mathrm{opp}}, \boldsymbol{\alpha}\big) \subset \mathtt{Rep}(\mathbb{C}\overline{Q}^{\mathrm{opp}}, \boldsymbol{\alpha})$. Therefore, the symplectic structure on $\mathcal{C}'_{n,\lambda}$ is the pullback $\phi^*\omega$ of the form (5.10). To calculate it, we substitute the expressions for X_i, Y_i, v_0, w_0 into (4.16). With v_0 and w_0 being constant and $\partial X_i/\partial \mu_i = 0$, we get

$$\phi^*\omega = \sum_{i \in I} \sum_{j<k} \mathrm{tr}\left(\frac{\partial Y_i}{\partial \nu_j}\frac{\partial X_i}{\partial \nu_k} - \frac{\partial Y_i}{\partial \nu_k}\frac{\partial X_i}{\partial \nu_j}\right) \mathrm{d}\nu_j \wedge \mathrm{d}\nu_k + \sum_{i \in I} \sum_{j,k} \mathrm{tr}\left(\frac{\partial Y_i}{\partial \mu_j}\frac{\partial X_i}{\partial \nu_k}\right) \mathrm{d}\mu_j \wedge \mathrm{d}\nu_k\,.$$

Since each X_i is a diagonal matrix, the off-diagonal part of Y_i does not play any role and can be ignored. Then it is easy to see that the only non-zero terms are those with $j = k$, where we have $\mathrm{tr}\left(\frac{\partial Y_i}{\partial \mu_j}\frac{\partial X_i}{\partial \nu_j}\right) = 1$. This leads to the result of the proposition. □

Remark 5.2. The symplectic form $\omega_{\mathcal{C}_{n,\lambda}}$ does not change under the transformation $\mu_j \to \mu_j - a\nu_j^{-1}$, therefore the parameter a in the formula for $(Y_i)_{jj}$ can be eliminated. However, the choice of a in (5.6) ensures that the Hamiltonians $\frac{1}{m}\mathrm{tr}Y^{mp}$ have the form $\sum_{j=1}^n \mu_j^{pm}$ plus the terms of degree $\leqslant mp - 2$ in momenta μ_j.

5.2. **Cherednik algebra and Calogero–Moser spaces.** In this section we recall the link between the Calogero–Moser spaces and Cherednik algebra, following [EG, EGGO], see also [BCE]. Our notation will mostly follow that of [BCE].

Consider the group $G = S_n \ltimes \Gamma^n$ acting on $\mathfrak{h} = \mathbb{C}^n$ and, a by natural extension, on the tensor algebra $T(\mathfrak{h} \oplus \mathfrak{h}^*)$. Fix parameters $t, c_{00}, c_1, \dots, c_{m-1} \in \mathbb{C}$, and let $c := (c_{00}, c_1, \dots, c_{m-1})$. The Cherednik algebra $H_{t,c}(G)$ is then defined as the quotient of $T(\mathfrak{h} \oplus \mathfrak{h}^*) * G$ by the following relations:

$$\begin{aligned} &[x_i, x_j] = 0, \qquad [y_i, y_j] = 0, \qquad 1 \leqslant i, j \leqslant n\,, \\ &[y_i, x_i] = t + c_{00} \sum_{j \neq i} \sum_{l=0}^{m-1} s_{ij} s_i^l s_j^{-l} + \sum_{l=1}^{m-1} c_l s_i^l, \qquad 1 \leqslant i \leqslant n\,, \\ &[y_i, x_j] = -c_{00} \sum_{l=0}^{m-1} s_{ij} \mu^l s_i^l s_j^{-l}\,, \qquad 1 \leqslant i \neq j \leqslant n\,. \end{aligned} \tag{5.11}$$

Here $\{x_i\}$ and $\{y_i\}$ are the standard dual bases of $\mathfrak{h}^*$ and $\mathfrak{h}$, respectively. Compared to the notation of [BCE], our μ, c_{00} and s_i correspond to ϵ^{-1}, k and α_i in *loc. cit.* Note that there is a misprint in the formulas (34) in [BCE]: the correct expression for $[y_i, x_j]$ should have ϵ^{-l} in place of ϵ^l. Note also that c_{00} in (5.11) is denoted by $k/2$ in [EGGO].

Next, let us describe following [EGGO] a functorial link between representations of $H_{t,c}$ and a suitable deformed preprojective algebra $\Pi^{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}$. To this end, let $G' = S_{n-1} \ltimes \Gamma^{n-1}$ be the subgroup of G which stabilises the first basis vector in $\mathfrak{h} = \mathbb{C}^n$. Write $\mathbf{e} := \frac{1}{|G|} \sum_{g \in G} g$ and $\mathbf{e}' := \frac{1}{|G'|} \sum_{g \in G'} g$ for the symmetrising idempotents in $\mathbb{C}G$ and $\mathbb{C}G'$, respectively. Now, recall the idempotents (2.2) and, for each $i = 0, 1, \dots, m-1$, define $\mathfrak{e}_i = (\epsilon_i)_1 \mathbf{e}'$, where $(\epsilon_i)_1$ is a copy of the idempotent $\epsilon_i \in \mathbb{C}\Gamma$ placed in the first component of $\mathbb{C}\Gamma^n$. One can check easily that $\mathfrak{e}_i$ are idempotents in $\mathbb{C}G \subset H_{t,c}$ satisfying the relations

$$x_1 \cdot \mathfrak{e}_{i+1} = \mathfrak{e}_i \cdot x_1\,, \quad y_1 \cdot \mathfrak{e}_i = \mathfrak{e}_{i+1} \cdot y_1\,.$$

Now, take an arbitrary (left) $H_{t,c}$-module E and put $V_\infty = \mathbf{e}E$ and $V_i = \mathfrak{e}_{-i}E$ for $i = 0, \dots, m-1$. Action by x_1, y_1 defines linear maps $X_i : V_i \to V_{i+1}$ and $Y_i : V_{i+1} \to V_i$. The space $\mathbf{e}E$ can be identified with the subspace of G-invariants in $\mathfrak{e}_0 E$, and we have

$$n\mathbf{e} = (1 + s_{12} + \dots + s_{1n})\mathfrak{e}_0\,.$$

This allows us to define linear maps $v_0 : V_\infty \to V_0$ and $w_0 : V_0 \to V_\infty$ by

$$v_0(\mathbf{e}u) = \mathfrak{e}_0(1 + s_{12} + \dots + s_{1n})u\,, \qquad w_0(\mathfrak{e}_0 u) = mc_{00}\mathbf{e}u\,. \tag{5.12}$$

Up to rescaling, these are the canonical inclusion and projection maps.

We have, for any $\mathfrak{e}_{-i}u \in V_i$,

$$(Y_iX_i - X_{i-1}Y_{i-1})\mathfrak{e}_{-i}u = [y_1, x_1]\mathfrak{e}_{-i}u = \mathfrak{e}_{-i}\Big(t + c_{00}\sum_{j\neq 1}\sum_{l=0}^{m-1} s_{1j}s_1^l s_j^{-l} + \sum_{l=1}^{m-1} c_l s_1^l\Big)u$$

$$= \mathfrak{e}_{-i}\Big(t + c_{00}\sum_{j\neq 1}\sum_{l=0}^{m-1} s_{1j}\mu^{-il} + \sum_{l=1}^{m-1} c_l\mu^{-il}\Big)u = \mathfrak{e}_{-i}\Big(t + mc_{00}\delta_{i,0}\sum_{j\neq 1} s_{1j} + \sum_{l=1}^{m-1} c_l\mu^{-il}\Big)u\,.$$

It follows that the maps X_i, Y_i, v_0, w_0 satisfy relations (5.1) with

$$\lambda_0 = t - mc_{00} + \sum_{l=1}^{m-1} c_l\,, \quad \lambda_i = t + \sum_{l=1}^{m-1} c_l \mu^{-il}\ (i \neq 0)\,. \tag{5.13}$$

We also have $w_0 v_0 = \lambda_\infty 1_{V_\infty}$ with $\lambda_\infty = mnc_{00}$. Thus, to every $H_{t,c}$-module we have associated a representation of $(\Pi^{\boldsymbol{\lambda}})^{\mathrm{opp}}$.

Now let us consider the case $t = 0$, denoting $H_c = H_{0,c}$. Let $U_c = \mathbf{e}H_c\mathbf{e}$ be the corresponding spherical subalgebra of H_c. According to [EG, Theorems 1.5, 1.6], the algebra U_c is finitely-generated commutative, without zero divisors; we can think of it being the ring of regular functions on an affine algebraic variety $\mathrm{Spec}(U_c)$, with $\mathbf{e}$ playing the role of the identity. The algebra U_c admits a non-commutative deformation $U_{t,c} = \mathbf{e}H_{t,c}\mathbf{e}$, which furnishes U_c with a Poisson bracket.

Theorem 5.3 ([EG], Theorem 1.13)**.** *For generic c, the variety $\mathrm{Spec}(U_c)$ is isomorphic to the Calogero–Moser space $\mathcal{C}_{n,\lambda}$ as an algebraic Poisson variety, with the parameters λ_i are related to c by* (5.13) *with $t = 0$, that is,*

$$\lambda_0 = -mc_{00} + \sum_{l=1}^{m-1} c_l\,, \quad \lambda_i = \sum_{l=1}^{m-1} c_l \mu^{-il}\ (i \neq 0)\,. \tag{5.14}$$

Remark 5.4. According to [M, Theorem 7.4], the genericity assumption on the parameters can be removed, i.e., the varieties $\mathrm{Max\,Spec}(U_c)$ and $\mathcal{C}_{n,\lambda}$ are isomorphic for any c.

Let us recall the construction of the isomorphism between $\mathrm{Spec}(U_c)$ and $\mathcal{C}_{n,\lambda}$, following [EG]. First, by Theorems 1.7, 3.1, 16.1 of [EG], $\mathrm{Spec}(U_c)$ can be identified with the moduli space of finite-dimensional H_c-modules. Moreover, for generic c all such modules are irreducible and isomorphic, as G-modules, to the regular representation $\mathbb{C}G$. Let E be such a module. As explained above, one can associate to E a representation of the deformed preprojective algebra $(\Pi^{\boldsymbol{\lambda}})^{\mathrm{opp}}$. Since $E \simeq \mathbb{C}G$, we easily find that $\dim V_\infty = 1$, $\dim V_i = n$. Thus, this represents a point of $\mathcal{C}_{n,\lambda}$, so we get a map $\theta : \mathrm{Spec}(U_c) \to \mathcal{C}_{n,\lambda}$, and as shown in [EG], θ is an isomorphism that respects the Poisson brackets. □

According to the above theorem, the induced algebra map $\theta^* : \mathbb{C}[\mathcal{C}_{n,\lambda}] \to U_c$ is an isomorphism of the coordinate rings. Let us calculate the image of $\mathrm{tr}\, Y^{jm}$ under this isomorphism. According to (4.33) we have

$$\mathrm{tr}\,(w_0 Y^{jm} v_0) = -\frac{\sum_{i\in I}\lambda_i}{m}\,\mathrm{tr}\, Y^{jm} = c_{00}\,\mathrm{tr}\, Y^{jm}\,,$$

and we just need to calculate how the map $w_0 Y^{jm} v_0$ acts on the one-dimensional space $V_\infty = \mathbf{e}E$. Applying the definitions (5.12), we get that

$$w_0 Y^{jm} v_0(\mathbf{e}u) = mc_{00}\mathbf{e}y_1^{jm}(1 + s_{12} + \cdots + s_{1n})u = mc_{00}\mathbf{e}(y_1^{jm} + \cdots + y_n^{jm})(\mathbf{e}u)\,.$$

Therefore,

$$\theta^*(\mathrm{tr}\, Y^{jm}) = m\,\mathbf{e}(y_1^{jm} + \cdots + y_n^{jm})\mathbf{e} \in U_c\,, \qquad j \in \mathbb{N}\,.$$

The functions $\frac{1}{m}\mathrm{tr}\, Y^{jm}$, $j = 1, \ldots, n$ are in involution on $\mathcal{C}_{n,\lambda}$ and so they define a completely integrable system. Similarly, the functions $\mathbf{e}(y_1^{jm} + \cdots + y_n^{jm})\mathbf{e}$ Poisson-commute on the variety $\mathrm{Spec}(U_c)$ and define a completely integrable system on it. By the above results, the Poisson map θ establish an isomorphism between these

two integrable systems. It remains to explain how this is related to the Calogero–Moser system that is usually constructed with the help of Dunkl operators. This is explained in Section 5.3.

5.3. **Relation to Dunkl operators.** A version of the Calogero–Moser system can be defined for any finite reflection group G, by using the Dunkl operators [D, DO]; this idea goes back to G. Heckman [He]. Below we outline that construction in the classical case for $G = \mathbb{Z}_m \wr S_n$, following [Et, EM].

For $\mathfrak{h} = \mathbb{C}^n$, let $(x_1, \dots, x_n, p_1, \dots, p_n)$ denote the standard canonical coordinates on the symplectic space $\mathfrak{h} \times \mathfrak{h}^* \simeq T^*(\mathfrak{h})$. We have an obvious action of G on $\mathfrak{h}_{reg} \times \mathfrak{h}^*$ and on the ring of functions $\mathbb{C}[\mathfrak{h}_{reg} \times \mathfrak{h}^*]$.

Having parameter c as above, let $\kappa_0, \dots, \kappa_{m-1} \in \mathbb{C}$ be chosen in such a way that

$$\sum_{r=1}^{m-1} c_r s^r = \sum_{l=0}^{m-1} m(\kappa_l - \kappa_{l-1})\epsilon_l \,, \tag{5.15}$$

which fixes all κ_i uniquely up to a simultaneous shift. The classical Dunkl operators for G are the following elements of $\mathbb{C}[\mathfrak{h}_{reg} \times \mathfrak{h}^*] * G$:

$$D_i = p_i - c_{00} \sum_{j \neq i} \sum_{r=0}^{m-1} \frac{1}{x_i - \mu^r x_j} s_i^r s_{ij} s_i^{-r} - \frac{1}{x_i} \sum_{l=0}^{m-1} m\kappa_l (\epsilon_l)_i \,, \tag{5.16}$$

where $(\epsilon_l)_i$ denotes the idempotent $\epsilon_l \in \mathbb{C}\Gamma$ placed in the i-th component in $\mathbb{C}\Gamma^n$,

$$(\epsilon_l)_i = \frac{1}{m} \sum_{r=0}^{m-1} \mu^{-lr} s_i^r \,.$$

Proposition 5.5 ([EM], Proposition 3.2 and Corollary 3.13)**.** *(1) The assignment $x_i \mapsto x_i$, $y_i \mapsto D_i$ and $g \mapsto g$ for $g \in G$ extends to an injective algebra map $\Theta : H_c \to \mathbb{C}[\mathfrak{h}_{reg} \times \mathfrak{h}^*] * G$, called the Dunkl embedding.*

(2) When restricted to the spherical subalgebra, the map Θ defines an embedding $U_c \hookrightarrow \mathbf{e}(\mathbb{C}[\mathfrak{h}_{reg} \times \mathfrak{h}^*] * G)\mathbf{e} \simeq \mathbb{C}[\mathfrak{h}_{reg} \times \mathfrak{h}^*]^G$. Under this embedding, the Poisson structure on U_c coming from its non-commutative deformation, $U_{t,c}$, coincides with the restriction of the natural Poisson structure on $\mathbb{C}[\mathfrak{h}_{reg} \times \mathfrak{h}^*]^G$.

Now define a linear map $\mathbf{m} : \mathbb{C}[\mathfrak{h}_{reg} \times \mathfrak{h}^*] * G \to \mathbb{C}[\mathfrak{h}_{reg} \times \mathfrak{h}^*]$ by the formula $\sum_{g \in G} B_g \cdot g \mapsto \sum_{g \in G} B_g$. Restricting $\mathbf{m} \circ \Theta$ onto the spherical subalgebra gives the embedding $U_c \hookrightarrow \mathbb{C}[\mathfrak{h}_{reg} \times \mathfrak{h}^*]^G$, as in the proposition above. The following result is a special case of the general construction of the classical Calogero–Moser system for an arbitrary complex reflection group, see [Et, Section 6.3] and [EM, Section 2.10].

Proposition 5.6. *The functions $L_j(x,p) = \mathbf{m} \circ \Theta(\mathbf{e}(y_1^{jm} + \dots + y_n^{jm})\mathbf{e})$, $j = 1, \dots, n$, are independent G-invariant and Poisson-commuting functions on $\mathfrak{h}_{reg} \times \mathfrak{h}^* = T^*\mathfrak{h}_{reg}$. Hence, they define a completely integrable system on $T^*\mathfrak{h}_{reg}$.*

Remark 5.7. According to [EFMV, Lemma 2.2], $\Theta(\mathbf{e}(y_1^{jm} + \dots + y_n^{jm})\mathbf{e})$ is already in $\mathbb{C}[\mathfrak{h}_{reg} \times \mathfrak{h}^*]$, i.e., it does not contain nontrivial elements of G. Thus, application of $\mathbf{m}$ in the construction of L_j is not necessary.

Remark 5.8. It is customary to assume that $\sum_{l=0}^{m-1} \kappa_l = 0$ in the definition of the Dunkl operators D_i. In this case the Hamiltonians $L_j(x,p)$ have the form $\sum_{i=1}^n p_i^{mj}$ plus the terms of degree $\leqslant mj - 2$ in momenta (cf. Example 5.12).

Earlier we have found that $\mathbf{e}L_j(x,p)\mathbf{e}$ equals $\frac{1}{m}\theta^*(\operatorname{tr} Y^{jm})$. Now we will make this relation more explicit, following the approach of [EM, Section 9.6]. Recall that $\mathcal{C}_{n,\lambda}$ has an open dense subset $\mathcal{C}'_{n,\lambda}$ with local coordinates $\{\mu_i,\nu_i\}$, see (5.2) and (5.5)–(5.7). We are going to construct similar coordinates on a subset of $\operatorname{Spec}(U_c)$. Take $\mu=(\mu_1,\dots,\mu_n)\in\mathfrak{h}^*$, $\nu=(\nu_1,\dots,\nu_n)\in\mathfrak{h}_{reg}$, and consider $\mathbb{C}_{\nu,\mu}=\mathbb{C}\cdot 1_{\nu,\mu}$ to be a one-dimensional representation of the algebra $\mathbb{C}[\mathfrak{h}_{reg}\times\mathfrak{h}^*]$ defined by

$$x_i\cdot 1_{\nu,\mu}=\nu_i\cdot 1_{\nu,\mu}\,,\qquad p_i\cdot 1_{\nu,\mu}=\mu_i\cdot 1_{\nu,\mu}\,.$$

Viewing $\mathbb{C}[\mathfrak{h}_{reg}\times\mathfrak{h}^*]$ as a subalgebra of $\mathbb{C}[\mathfrak{h}_{reg}\times\mathfrak{h}^*]*G$, we take E to be the representation of $\mathbb{C}[\mathfrak{h}_{reg}\times\mathfrak{h}^*]*G$ induced from $\mathbb{C}_{\nu,\mu}$. Composing this with the Dunkl embedding Θ gives us a representation, denoted $E_{\nu,\mu}$, of H_c. Clearly, $E_{\nu,\mu}\simeq\mathbb{C}G$ as a G-module, so it is spanned by the elements $g\cdot 1_{\nu,\mu}$, $g\in G$. It was explained above how to associate to $E_{\nu,\mu}$ a point of $\mathcal{C}_{n,\lambda}$. We have $V_i=\mathfrak{e}_{-i}E_{\nu,\mu}$, and we can choose the elements $\mathfrak{e}_{-i}\,s_{1j}\cdot 1_{\nu,\mu}$, $j=1,\dots,n$, as a basis of V_i, identifying it with $\mathbb{C}^n$. Here we use the convention that $s_{11}=1$. Also, we have $V_\infty=\mathbf{e}E_{\nu,\mu}=\mathbb{C}\mathbf{e}\cdot 1_{\nu,\mu}$, which we identify with $\mathbb{C}$. With these identifications, the linear maps X_i,Y_i,v_0,w_0 become matrices and column/row vectors, respectively.

We have $x_1(\mathfrak{e}_{-i}\,s_{1j}\cdot 1_{\nu,\mu})=\mathfrak{e}_{-i-1}\,s_{1j}x_j\cdot 1_{\nu,\mu}=\nu_j\mathfrak{e}_{-i-1}\,s_{1j}\cdot 1_{\nu,\mu}$. Therefore, the matrices X_i look exactly like in (5.2). Also, from the definitions of v_0,w_0 and with the help of (5.14) it is easy to check that (5.5) holds. It remains to calculate Y_i. For example, to calculate the matrix entries of Y_0 we consider $y_1(\mathfrak{e}_{-1}\,s_{1i}\cdot 1_{\nu,\mu})=\mathfrak{e}_0\,s_{1i}D_i\cdot 1_{\nu,\mu}$. Using that

$$D_i=p_i+c_{00}\sum_{j\neq i}\sum_{r=0}^{m-1}s_i^r s_{ij}s_i^{-r}(x_i-\mu^r x_j)^{-1}-\sum_{l=0}^{m-1}m\kappa_l(\epsilon_{l+1})_i x_i^{-1}\,,$$

we find that

$$y_1(\mathfrak{e}_{-1}\,s_{1i}\cdot 1_{\nu,\mu})=(\mu_i-\frac{m\kappa_{-1}}{\nu_i})\mathfrak{e}_0\,s_{1i}\cdot 1_{\nu,\mu}+c_{00}\sum_{j\neq i}\sum_{r=0}^{m-1}\frac{1}{\nu_i-\mu^r\nu_j}\mathfrak{e}_0\,s_{1j}\cdot 1_{\nu,\mu}\,.$$

This agrees with the formulas (5.6)–(5.7) for $Y_0:V_1\to V_0$, provided that $a+\lambda_0=-m\kappa_{m-1}$, that is,

$$\kappa_{m-1}=\sum_{r=1}^{m-1}\frac{m-r}{m^2}\lambda_r\,. \tag{5.17}$$

This together with (5.15) fixes uniquely the parameters κ_l. Note that once Y_0 is known, all other matrices Y_i are uniquely determined from the relations (5.3)–(5.4). Therefore, they will also agree with (5.6)–(5.7). Hence, the representations $E_{\nu,\mu}$ with $(\nu,\mu)\in\mathfrak{h}_{\rm reg}\times\mathfrak{h}^*$ form a dense subset of $\operatorname{Spec}(U_c)$, with the coordinates $\{\nu_i,\mu_i\}$ matching exactly those on $\mathcal{C}_{n,\lambda}$ under the isomorphism $\theta:\operatorname{Spec}(U_c)\to\mathcal{C}_{n,\lambda}$. We may think of $\operatorname{Spec}(U_c)$ as the moduli space of one-dimensional representations of U_c: given $E=E_{\nu,\mu}$ as above, the corresponding one-dimensional representation is $\mathbf{e}E_{\nu,\mu}=\mathbb{C}\mathbf{e}\cdot 1_{\nu,\mu}$. A function $\mathbf{e}L_j(x,p)\mathbf{e}=\frac{1}{m}\theta^*(\operatorname{tr}Y^{jm})$ acts on $\mathbf{e}\cdot 1_{\nu,\mu}$ by left multiplication, resulting in $\mathbf{e}L_j(\nu,\mu)\cdot 1_{\nu,\mu}$. This implies the following results.

Proposition 5.9. *Given arbitrary c, define λ_i and κ_l by* (5.14), (5.15) *and* (5.17). *Let the matrices Y_i be as in* (5.6)–(5.7), *and $Y=Y(\nu,\mu)$ be the $mn\times mn$ matrix $Y=\sum_i Y_i\in\operatorname{End}(\oplus_i V_i)$. Then for any $j\in\mathbb{N}$ we have $\frac{1}{m}\operatorname{tr}(Y^{jm})=L_j(\nu,\mu)$, where $L_j=L_j(x,p)$ are the Hamiltonians of the Calogero–Moser problem as in Prop. 5.6.*

Corollary 5.10. *The matrix $Y = \sum_i Y_i$ is a Lax matrix for the Calogero–Moser system for $G = \mathbb{Z}_m \wr S_n$, in the sense that it deforms isospectrally under any of the commuting flows defined by the Hamiltonians $L_j(\nu, \mu)$, and the traces of powers of Y produce the full set of first integrals in involution. The symplectic quotient $\mathcal{C}_{n,\lambda}$ is a completed phase space for the Calogero–Moser system, with the flows extending to $\mathcal{C}_{n,\lambda}$ and obtained by the symplectic reduction from the linear flows* (4.38).

Remark 5.11. Using the formulas $m(\kappa_l - \kappa_{l-1}) = \sum_{r=1}^{m-1} c_r \mu^{rl} = \lambda_{-l} - \delta_{l0}|\lambda|$ one can check that the relation (5.17) leads to $\sum_{l=0}^{m-1} \kappa_l = 0$, which agrees with Remarks 5.8 and 5.2.

Example 5.12. Consider the case $m = 2$. In this case $c = (c_{00}, c_1)$, $\lambda_0 = -2c_{00} + c_1$, $\lambda_1 = -c_1$. This gives $a = 2c_{00} - c_1/2$ and $\kappa_0 = -\kappa_1 = c_1/4$. We will use x, p instead of ν, μ. The matrix Y then has the form $\begin{pmatrix} 0 & Y_1 \\ Y_0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}$ where

$$(Y_0)_{ii} = p_i + \frac{c_1}{2x_i}\,, \qquad (Y_0)_{ij} = \frac{-2c_{00}x_j}{x_i^2 - x_j^2}\,,$$
$$(Y_1)_{ii} = p_i - \frac{c_1}{2x_i}\,, \qquad (Y_1)_{ij} = \frac{-2c_{00}x_i}{x_i^2 - x_j^2}\,.$$

Up to a change of basis, this is equivalent to the well-known Lax matrix for the rational Calogero–Moser system in type B_n [OP1], see also [BCS, eq. (4.48)]. We have

$$\frac{1}{2}\mathrm{tr}\, Y^2 = \sum_{i=1}^{n} \left(p_i^2 - \frac{c_1^2}{4x_i^2} \right) - \sum_{i<j} \frac{4c_{00}^2(x_i^2 + x_j^2)}{(x_i^2 - x_j^2)^2}\,.$$

Note that setting $c_1 = 0$ leads to the D_n case.

Remark 5.13. Note that the link with the Calogero–Moser system was established only for a special choice of the dimension vector $\boldsymbol{\alpha} = (1, n\delta)$. It would be interesting to understand the situation for general $\boldsymbol{\alpha} = (1, \alpha) \in \Delta_+(Q)$. We expect that every imaginary positive root $(1, \alpha)$ can be reduced to $(1, n\delta)$ by a sequence of simple reflections. In such a case the reflection functors [CB2] induce an isomorphism of the symplectic varieties $\mathcal{C}_{\alpha,\lambda}$ and $\mathcal{C}_{n,\lambda} = \mathcal{C}_{n\delta,\lambda'}$ for generic λ. Moreover, one can also check that the reflection functors preserve the Poisson-commutative subalgebra generated by $\mathrm{tr}\, Y^{mj}$, $j \geqslant 1$.

5.4. **Spin particle dynamics.** For the full hierarchy (2.18), the solutions are parameterised by the varieties (3.17) for the quiver Q as in (3.14). As in the previous section, let us consider the special choice of the dimension vector $\boldsymbol{\alpha} = (1, n\delta)$ where $\delta = (1, \dots, 1)$. Let us again abbreviate the varieties $\mathcal{C}_{n\delta,\lambda}(Q)$ to $\mathcal{C}_{n,\lambda}$ for simplicity. From the formula (3.27), we find that $\dim \mathcal{C}_{n,\lambda} = 2mn$. Points of $\mathcal{C}_{n,\lambda}$ are represented by linear maps

$$X_i \colon V_i \to V_{i+1}\,, \qquad Y_i \colon V_{i+1} \to V_i\,, \qquad v_i \colon \mathbb{C} \to V_i\,, \qquad w_i \colon V_i \to \mathbb{C}\,,$$

satisfying the relations (3.21):

$$Y_i X_i - X_{i-1} Y_{i-1} - v_i w_i = \lambda_i 1_{V_i} \qquad (i \in I)\,. \tag{5.18}$$

Similarly to the previous case, we look at the subset $\mathcal{C}'_{n,\lambda} \subset \mathcal{C}_{n,\lambda}$ where $X_{m-1} \dots X_1 X_0$ has distinct non-zero eigenvalues $\nu_1^m, \dots, \nu_n^m$. Then by choosing suitable bases in

each of V_i we will have

$$X_i = \mathrm{diag}(\nu_1, \dots, \nu_n)\,, \tag{5.19}$$

implying that

$$(Y_i)_{jj}\nu_j - \nu_j(Y_{i-1})_{jj} - (v_i w_i)_{jj} = \lambda_i\,, \tag{5.20}$$

$$(Y_i)_{jk}\nu_k - \nu_j(Y_{i-1})_{jk} - (v_i w_i)_{jk} = 0 \qquad (j \neq k)\,. \tag{5.21}$$

Summing (5.20) over i we obtain that for any j,

$$\sum_{i\in I}(v_i w_i)_{jj} = -|\lambda|\,.$$

The matrices Y_i are then found to be as follows

$$(Y_i)_{jj} = \mu_j + \frac{1}{\nu_j}\sum_{r=0}^{i}\big(\lambda_r + (v_r w_r)_{jj}\big) + \frac{1}{\nu_j}\sum_{r=0}^{m-1}\frac{r-m}{m}\big(\lambda_r + (v_r w_r)_{jj}\big)\,, \tag{5.22}$$

$$(Y_i)_{jk} = -\sum_{l=0}^{m-1}\frac{(v_{i-l}w_{i-l})_{jk}\nu_j^l\nu_k^{m-l-1}}{\nu_j^m - \nu_k^m} \qquad (j \neq k)\,, \tag{5.23}$$

where $i = 0, 1, \dots, m-1$ (the index $i-l$ in the second formula is taken modulo m).

Remark 5.14. The second sum in the right hand side of (5.22) is added to have the relation $\sum_{i\in I}(Y_i)_{jj} = m\mu_j$. This choice is important for Prop. 5.15 below.

It seems convenient to organise the column and row vectors v_i, w_i into matrices v and w of size $n\times m$ and $m\times n$, respectively, and then divide them into rows and columns, each of length m. This way we get n rows φ_j and n columns ψ_j, with $(v_i)_j = (\varphi_j)_i$ and $(w_i)_j = (\psi_j)_i$. The formulas for Y_i then become as follows:

$$(Y_i)_{jj} = \mu_j + \frac{1}{\nu_j}\sum_{r=0}^{i}\big(\lambda_r + (\psi_j\varphi_j)_{rr}\big) + \frac{1}{\nu_j}\sum_{r=0}^{m-1}\frac{r-m}{m}\big(\lambda_r + (\psi_j\varphi_j)_{rr}\big)\,, \tag{5.24}$$

$$(Y_i)_{jk} = -\sum_{l=0}^{m-1}\frac{(\psi_k\varphi_j)_{i-l,i-l}\,\nu_j^l\nu_k^{m-l-1}}{\nu_j^m - \nu_k^m} \qquad (j \neq k)\,, \tag{5.25}$$

with the constraint $\varphi_j\psi_j = -|\lambda|$ for all j. Note that acting on each V_i by a diagonal matrix with diagonal entries $d_1, \dots, d_n$ in accordance with (3.26), leaves ν_j, μ_j unchanged and replaces φ_j, ψ_j by $d_j\varphi_j$ and $d_j^{-1}\psi_j$. By analogy with [GH] (cf. [W2]), the quantities φ_j, ψ_j can be thought of as spin variables attached to the j-th particle of an n-particle system of Calogero–Moser type. With each pair (φ_j, ψ_j) we can therefore associate a point q_j of the symplectic variety Q_m (cf. [W2]):

$$Q_m = \big\{(\varphi,\psi) \in (\mathbb{C}^m)^* \oplus \mathbb{C}^m \mid \varphi\psi = -|\lambda|\big\}/\mathbb{C}^\times\,.$$

The above formulas then give a local parameterisation of $\mathcal{C}'_{n,\lambda}$ by $\{\nu_j, \mu_j, q_j\}$.

By an elementary residue calculation,

$$\frac{\nu_j^l\nu_k^{m-l-1}}{\nu_j^m - \nu_k^m} = \frac{1}{m}\sum_{r=0}^{m-1}\frac{\mu^{-lr}}{\mu^r\nu_j - \nu_k}\,.$$

As a result, the formula (5.25) can be replaced with

$$(Y_i)_{jk} = \sum_{r\in I}\frac{\mu^{-ir}\,(\varphi_j\,E^r\,\psi_k\,)}{m(\nu_k - \mu^r\nu_j)}\,, \qquad E^r = \mathrm{diag}(1, \mu^r, \mu^{2r}, \dots, \mu^{(m-1)r})\,. \tag{5.26}$$

Recall that the symplectic structure (4.16) induces a symplectic structure on $\mathcal{C}_{n,\lambda}$.

Proposition 5.15. *In terms of $\nu_j, \mu_j, q_j = (\varphi_j, \psi_j)$ the symplectic structure on $\mathcal{C}_{n,\lambda}$ has the form*

$$\omega_{\mathcal{C}_{n,\lambda}} = \sum_{j=1}^{n} (m\,\mathrm{d}\mu_j \wedge \mathrm{d}\nu_j - \mathrm{d}\varphi_j \wedge \mathrm{d}\psi_j)\,.$$

Here, by abuse of notation, we do not make distinction between the form $\mathrm{d}\varphi_j \wedge \mathrm{d}\psi_j = \sum_{r=0}^{m-1} \mathrm{d}\varphi_{j,r} \wedge \mathrm{d}\psi_{j,r}$ on $T^*\mathbb{C}^m$ and the corresponding symplectic form on Q_m.

Proof. The symplectic form on $\mathtt{Rep}\big(\mathbb{C}\overline{Q}^{\mathrm{opp}}, \boldsymbol{\alpha}\big)$ in this case is

$$\omega = \sum_{i \in I} \Big(\mathrm{tr}(\mathrm{d}Y_i \wedge \mathrm{d}X_i) + \mathrm{d}w_i \wedge \mathrm{d}v_i \Big)\,.$$

Let view the formulas (5.19), (5.24), (5.25) as describing a map

$$\phi\colon T^*\mathfrak{h}_{reg} \times (T^*\mathbb{C}^m)^n \to \mathtt{Rep}\big(\mathbb{C}\overline{Q}^{\mathrm{opp}}, \boldsymbol{\alpha}\big)\,.$$

Similarly to the proof of Prop. 5.1 we need to calculate $\phi^*\omega$. In the same way, only the diagonal entries of Y_i will contribute to $\phi^*\omega$. We have

$$\mathrm{d}(Y_i)_{jj} = \mathrm{d}\mu_j + \frac{1}{\nu_j}\Big(\sum_{r=0}^{i} \mathrm{d}\big(\psi_j\varphi_j\big)_{rr} + \sum_{r=0}^{m-1} \frac{r-m}{m} \mathrm{d}\big(\psi_j\varphi_j\big)_{rr} \Big) + \frac{\partial (Y_i)_{jj}}{\partial \nu_j} \mathrm{d}\nu_j\,.$$

The last term will vanish after taking the wedge product with $\mathrm{d}(X_i)_{jj} = \mathrm{d}\nu_j$. A simple calculation then shows that $\sum_{i=0}^{m-1} \mathrm{d}(Y_i)_{jj} \wedge \mathrm{d}(X_i)_{jj} = m\,\mathrm{d}\mu_j \wedge \mathrm{d}\nu_j$. □

The Hamiltonians H_k (4.24) after substituting (5.24)–(5.25) produce Poisson commuting functions on the phase space $\mathfrak{h}_{reg} \times \mathfrak{h}^* \times (Q_m)^n$ equipped with the symplectic form $\omega_{\mathcal{C}_{n,\lambda}}$. They define a system which can be interpreted as a spin version of the n-particle Calogero–Moser system for $G = \mathbb{Z}_m \wr S_n$, with the spin variables $(\varphi_j, \psi_j) \in Q_m$. It is a spacial case of a more general system with spin variables, see Subsection 6.3.

Note that the choice of coordinates on $\mathcal{C}'_{n,\lambda}$ is only unique up to the action of G, coming from the embedding (5.8). Explicitly in coordinates this action permutes $\{\nu_j\}$, $\{\mu_j\}$, $\{q_j = (\varphi_j, \psi_j)\}$ simultaneously and replaces ν_j, μ_j, φ_j, ψ_j by $\nu^{r_j}\nu_j$, $\mu^{-r_j}\mu_j$, $\varphi_j E^{r_j}$, $E^{-r_j}\psi_j$, respectively, where E^r is the same as in (5.26). It follows that $\mathcal{C}'_{n,\lambda} \simeq \mathfrak{h}_{reg} \times \mathfrak{h}^* \times (Q_m)^n/G$. We obtain the following result.

Proposition 5.16. *Let $H_k = H_k(\nu, \mu, q)$ be the functions of $(\nu, \mu, q) \in \mathfrak{h}_{reg} \times \mathfrak{h}^* \times (Q_m)^n$, obtained by substituting (5.24)–(5.25) into (4.24). Then H_k with $k = 1, \dots, mn$ are functionally independent, Poisson commuting functions and hence define a completely integrable system. The Hamiltonian flows defined by H_k extend from $\mathfrak{h}_{reg} \times \mathfrak{h}^* \times (Q_m)^n/G$ to produce complete flows on the Calogero–Moser space $\mathcal{C}_{n,\lambda} = \mathcal{C}_{n\delta,\lambda}$ for the quiver (3.14).*

The number of integrals, mn, is clearly the half of the dimension of the phase space $\mathfrak{h}_{reg} \times \mathfrak{h}^* \times (Q_m)^n$, so the only thing to prove is that H_k with $k = 1, \dots, mn$ are independent. This is shown in a more general case in Section 6 (Proposition 6.7). □

Example 5.17. Consider the case $m = 2$. Let us write down the first two Hamiltonians in the coordinates ν_j, μ_j, q_j. In this case we have two-component spin variables $\varphi_j = (\varphi_{j0}, \varphi_{j1})$, $\psi_j = (\psi_{j0}, \psi_{j1})^\top$. Denote $E = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & -1 \end{pmatrix}$, $F_\pm = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & \pm 1 \\ 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}$. Then we have

$$H_1 = -\sum_{i=0,1} w_i Y_i v_{i+1} = -\sum_{j=1}^{n} \Big((\varphi_j F_+ \psi_j)\mu_j + \frac{1}{2\nu_j}(\varphi_j F_- \psi_j)(\lambda_0 + \varphi_{j0}\psi_{j0}) \Big) \\ - \sum_{j\neq k} \Big(\frac{(\varphi_j F_+ \psi_k)(\varphi_k \psi_j)}{2(\nu_j - \nu_k)} + \frac{(\varphi_j F_- \psi_k)(\varphi_k E \psi_j)}{2(\nu_j + \nu_k)} \Big),$$

$$H_2 = \frac{|\lambda|}{2}\mathrm{tr} Y^2 = |\lambda| \sum_{j=1}^{n} \Big(\mu_j^2 - \frac{1}{4\nu_j^2}(\lambda_0 + \varphi_{j0}\psi_{j0})^2 \Big) \\ + |\lambda| \sum_{j\neq k} \Big(\frac{(\varphi_j \psi_k)(\varphi_k \psi_j)}{4(\nu_j - \nu_k)^2} + \frac{(\varphi_j E \psi_k)(\varphi_k E \psi_j)}{4(\nu_j + \nu_k)^2} + \frac{\varphi_{j1}\psi_{k1}\varphi_{k0}\psi_{j0} - \varphi_{j0}\psi_{k0}\varphi_{k1}\psi_{j1}}{2(\nu_j^2 - \nu_k^2)} \Big),$$

where $(\lambda_0 + \varphi_{j0}\psi_{j0}) = -(\lambda_1 + \varphi_{j1}\psi_{j1})$.

In the case $m = 2$, when G is of B_n type, some spin versions of Calogero-Moser problem can be constructed in the framework of Lie algebras, see [LX] and references therein. However they look somewhat different to our system. To the best of our knowledge, for $m > 2$ spin generalizations of the Calogero–Moser system for $G = \mathbb{Z}_m \wr S_n$ have not been considered before.

6. Multicomponent generalisation

The KP hierarchy admits a multicomponent (matrix) generalisation [DJKM], [Sa], see also [Di]. In the same spirit one can generalise the hierarchy (2.18). Below we introduce such a hierarchy, and construct its solutions by using quivers.

6.1. **Definition of the hierarchy.**

We will follow closely the notation of [Di].

We will work with the ring $\mathrm{Mat}(d, \mathbb{C}) \otimes \mathcal{P}$ of matrices over the ring $\mathcal{P}$ (2.13). The operations $(\cdot)_+$ and $(\cdot)_-$ on $\mathcal{P}$ induce similar operations on this ring.

Let E_α ($\alpha = 1, \dots, d$) be the diagonal matrices with the diagonal entries $(E_\alpha)_{\beta\beta} = \delta_{\alpha\beta}$. We have $E_\alpha E_\beta = \delta_{\alpha\beta} E_\alpha$ and $E_1 + \ldots + E_d = 1$.

Now consider the elements of $\mathrm{Mat}(d, \mathbb{C}) \otimes \mathcal{P}$ of the following form

$$L = y + \sum_{l=0}^{\infty} f_l y^{-l}, \tag{6.1}$$

$$R_\alpha = E_\alpha + \sum_{l=1}^{\infty} r_{l\alpha} y^{-l} \qquad (\alpha = 1, \dots, d) \tag{6.2}$$

where $f_l, r_{l\alpha} \in \mathrm{Mat}(d, \mathbb{C}) \otimes \big(\mathbb{C}(x) * \Gamma\big)$.

We impose the following relations on L, R_α:

$$[L, R_\alpha] = 0\,, \qquad R_\alpha R_\beta = \delta_{\alpha\beta} R_\alpha\,, \qquad \sum_{\alpha=1}^{d} R_\alpha = 1\,. \tag{6.3}$$

The matrix generalisation of the hierarchy (2.18) is the following system of equations on $\{L, R_\alpha\}$:

$$\frac{\partial L}{\partial t_{k\beta}} = \left[(L^k R_\beta)_+, L\right], \tag{6.4}$$

$$\frac{\partial R_\alpha}{\partial t_{k\beta}} = \left[(L^k R_\beta)_+, R_\alpha\right], \tag{6.5}$$

where $t_{k\beta}$ ($\beta = 1, \dots, d$, $k = 0, 1, \dots$) are the time variables. Note that it follows from (6.3) that $\sum_{\beta=1}^{d} \frac{\partial}{\partial t_{0\beta}} = 0$.

The following proposition and its proof is parallel to Prop. 2.4

Proposition 6.1. (1) *The equations* (6.4), (6.5) *imply the zero-curvature equations:*

$$\Big[\frac{\partial}{\partial t_{k\beta}} - (L^k R_\alpha)_+ \,,\, \frac{\partial}{\partial t_{l\beta}} - (L^l R_\beta)_+\Big] = 0 \qquad\qquad (k, l \geqslant 0). \tag{6.6}$$

(2) *Flows* (6.4), (6.5) *pairwise commute and preserve the relations* (6.3).

We will also impose the following constraint analogous to (2.20):

$$(f_{0,\alpha\alpha})_e = 0 \qquad\qquad (\alpha = 1, \dots, d), \tag{6.7}$$

where $f_{0,\alpha\alpha} \in \mathbb{C}(x) * \Gamma$ are the diagonal entries of the coefficient f_0 in (6.1). These conditions (6.7) are preserved by the flows (6.4), (6.5).

For $M \in 1 + \mathrm{Mat}(d, \mathbb{C}) \otimes \mathcal{P}_-$, define L and R_α by the following formulas:

$$L = MyM^{-1}, \qquad\qquad R_\alpha = ME_\alpha M^{-1}. \tag{6.8}$$

It is clear that these elements have the form (6.1), (6.2) and satisfy (6.3), (6.7). Note that $L^k R_\alpha = My^k E_\alpha M^{-1}$.

Proposition 6.2. (cf. Prop. 2.6). *Suppose* $M \in 1 + \mathrm{Mat}(d, \mathbb{C}) \otimes \mathcal{P}_-$ *depends on* $t_{k\beta}$ *and satisfies the equation*

$$\frac{\partial M}{\partial t_{k\beta}} = -\big(My^k E_\beta M^{-1}\big)_- \cdot M\,. \tag{6.9}$$

Then L *and* R_α *defined by* (6.8) *satisfy the equations* (6.4), (6.5).

Remark 6.3. A more general hierarchy can be constructed by allowing in (6.3)–(6.5) L of the form

$$L = Ay + \sum_{l=0}^{\infty} f_l y^{-l}, \tag{6.10}$$

where $A = \mathrm{diag}(a_1, \dots, a_d)$ with non-zero $a_\alpha \in \mathbb{C}$ (cf. [**?**]). Solutions to this hierarchy can then be constructed as follows. Let M be an element satisfying the assumptions of Prop. 6.2. Then $L_A = MAyM^{-1}$ and $R_\alpha = ME_\alpha M^{-1}$ satisfy the equations (6.3)–(6.5) after rescaling the time variables by $t_{k\beta} \to a_\beta^{-k} t_{k\beta}$.

6.2. **Constructions of solutions.** We are going to construct solutions of the hierarchy (6.3)–(6.5), parametrised by Calogero–Moser spaces associated with the quivers (3.12), (3.13).

Let Q be the quiver (3.12) and $\mathcal{C}_{\alpha,\lambda} = \mathcal{C}_{\alpha,\lambda}(Q)$ be the Calogero–Moser space (3.17):

$$\mathcal{C}_{\alpha,\lambda}(Q) = \mathtt{Rep}\big((\Pi^{\boldsymbol{\lambda}})^{\mathrm{opp}}, \boldsymbol{\alpha}\big)//\mathtt{GL}(\alpha)\,. \tag{6.11}$$

Recall that here $\alpha \in \mathbb{N}_0^m$, $\lambda \in \mathbb{C}^m$ and $\boldsymbol{\alpha} = (1, \alpha)$, $\boldsymbol{\lambda} = (-\lambda\cdot\alpha, \lambda)$. A point of $\mathcal{C}_{\alpha,\lambda}$ represented by a collection of maps

$$\begin{aligned} &X_i\colon V_i \to V_{i+1}\,, && Y_i\colon V_{i+1} \to V_i\,,\\ &v_{i,\alpha}\colon \mathbb{C} \to V_i\,, && w_{i,\alpha}\colon V_i \to \mathbb{C} && (\alpha = 1,\dots,d) \end{aligned}$$

corresponding to arrows a_i, a_i^*, $b_{i,\alpha}$ and $b_{i,\alpha}^*$, respectively. These maps should satisfy the relations (cf. (3.21)–(3.22))

$$Y_iX_i - X_{i-1}Y_{i-1} - \sum_{\alpha=1}^{d} v_{i,\alpha}w_{i,\alpha} = \lambda_i 1_{V_i}\,, \tag{6.12}$$

$$\sum_{i\in I}\sum_{\alpha=1}^{d} w_{i,\alpha}v_{i,\alpha} = \lambda_\infty\,. \tag{6.13}$$

(As before, (6.13) follows from (6.12).)

Let us define maps

$$v_i\colon \mathbb{C}^d \to V_i\,, \qquad\qquad w_i\colon V_i \to \mathbb{C}^d$$

by $v_i = (v_{i,1},\dots,v_{i,d})$, $w_i = (w_{i,1},\dots,w_{i,d})$. Then the relations (6.12) take the form

$$Y_iX_i - X_{i-1}Y_{i-1} - v_iw_i = \lambda_i 1_{V_i}\,, \tag{6.14}$$

looking similar to (3.21).

Introducing $V = V_0 \oplus \ldots \oplus V_{m-1}$ and $X, Y \in \mathrm{End}(V)$ as in (3.23) the relation (3.24) still holds true.

We will be assuming that λ is regular in the sense of (3.18). Then using Prop. 3.1 we find, similarly to (3.27), that

$$\dim \mathcal{C}_{\alpha,\lambda} = 2\sum_{i\in I}(\alpha_i\alpha_{i+1} + d\alpha_i - \alpha_i^2) = 2d\sum_{i\in I}\alpha_i - \sum_{i\in I}(\alpha_i - \alpha_{i+1})^2. \tag{6.15}$$

Recall that the space $\mathcal{C}_{\alpha,\lambda}$ is a symplectic quotient (see (3.6)). The symplectic structure on it is induced by the symplectic structure on $\mathtt{Rep}\big((\mathbb{C}Q)^{\mathrm{opp}}, \boldsymbol{\alpha}\big)$ which has the form

$$\omega = \sum_{i\in I}\big(\mathrm{tr}(\mathrm{d}Y_i\wedge\mathrm{d}X_i) + \mathrm{tr}(\mathrm{d}w_i\wedge\mathrm{d}v_i)\big). \tag{6.16}$$

The Poisson bracket corresponding to (6.16) are

$$\big\{(X_i)_{ab}, (Y_j)_{cd}\big\} = \delta_{ij}\delta_{ad}\delta_{bc}\,, \qquad \big\{(v_{i,\alpha})_a, (w_{j,\beta})_b\big\} = \delta_{ij}\delta_{ab}\delta_{\alpha\beta}\,. \tag{6.17}$$

Following the idea of [GH], consider the following functions on $\mathcal{C}_{\alpha,\lambda}$:

$$I_k(A) := \sum_{i\in I}\mathrm{tr}\big(Aw_iY^kv_{i+k}\big), \qquad\qquad A \in \mathrm{Mat}(d,\mathbb{C}).$$

The functions $I_k(A)$ with $k = 0, 1, \dots$ and $A \in \mathrm{Mat}(d, \mathbb{C})$ form a vector space, closed under the Poisson bracket:

$$\{I_k(A), I_l(B)\} = I_{k+l}([A, B]).$$

Choosing $A = -E_\beta$ ($\beta = 1, \dots, d$), we get Poisson-commuting functions $H_{k,\beta} := -I_k(E_\beta)$. The Hamiltonian flow on $\mathcal{C}_{\alpha,\lambda}$ looks as follows:

$$\dot{X} = -\sum_{l=0}^{m-1}\sum_{a=0}^{k-1} Y^a v_l E_\beta w_{l-k} Y^{k-a-1}\,, \qquad \dot{Y} = 0\,, \tag{6.18}$$

$$\dot{w}_i = E_\beta w_{i-k} Y^k\,, \qquad \dot{v}_j = -Y^k v_{j+k} E_\beta\,. \tag{6.19}$$

Note that these equations can be integrated explicitly similarly to (4.31), (4.32).

To construct solutions of the hierarchy (6.4),(6.5) let us introduce an element $M \in \mathrm{Mat}(d, \mathbb{C}) \otimes \mathcal{P}$ by the same formula (4.1):

$$M = 1 - \sum_{i,j\in I} \epsilon_i w_i (X - x1_V)^{-1}(Y - y1_V)^{-1} v_j \epsilon_j\,. \tag{6.20}$$

Proposition 6.4. *Let $L = MyM^{-1}$ and $R_\alpha = ME_\alpha M^{-1}$ with M given by* (6.20). *If X, Y, v_i, w_i satisfy the equations* (6.18), (6.19) *then L and R_α ($\alpha = 1, \dots, d$) satisfy the equations $\dot{L} = [(L^k R_\beta)_+, L]$, $\dot{R}_\alpha = [(L^k R_\beta)_+, R_\alpha]$.*

Proof. Proof essentially repeats the arguments from Section 4.

First, since the relations for X, Y, v_i, w_i have the same form, the identifies (4.4)–(4.7) and Lemma 4.1 carry through. Furthermore, $LR_\beta = My^k E_\beta M^{-1}$ and therefore LR_β can be found from the right hand side of (4.11) by substituting $y^k \to y^k E_\beta$. After that,repeating the same steps as in the proof of Lemma 4.2, we obtain that

$$\begin{aligned}\left(My^k E_\beta M^{-1}\right)_- = \left(L^k R_\beta\right)_- = \sum_{i,j} \epsilon_i E_\beta w_{i-k} Y^k \widehat{Y}^{-1}\widehat{X}^{-1} v_j \epsilon_j \\ - \sum_{i,j} \epsilon_i w_i \widehat{X}^{-1}\widehat{Y}^{-1} Y^k v_{j+k} E_\beta \epsilon_j - \sum_{i,j,\ell} \epsilon_i w_i \widehat{X}^{-1}\widehat{Y}^{-1} Y^k v_\ell E_\beta w_{\ell-k} \widehat{Y}^{-1}\widehat{X}^{-1} v_j \epsilon_j \\ + \sum_{i,j,\ell}\sum_{a=0}^{k-1} \epsilon_i w_i \widehat{X}^{-1} Y^a v_\ell E_\beta w_{\ell-k} Y^{k-1-a} \widehat{Y}^{-1}\widehat{X}^{-1} v_j \epsilon_j\,.\end{aligned} \tag{6.21}$$

Note that the right-hand side of this expression is obtained from (4.10) by replacing

$$w_{i-k} \to E_\beta w_{i-k}\,, \qquad v_{j+k} \to v_{j+k} E_\beta\,, \qquad v_\ell w_{\ell-k} \to v_\ell E_\beta w_{\ell-k}\,. \tag{6.22}$$

It is then easy to check that the proof of Prop. 4.3 can be repeated by making the replacements (6.22) throughout. □

Now varying β and k in (6.18), (6.19), we have a family of commuting Hamiltonian flows on $\mathcal{C}_{\alpha,\lambda}$, so by the above Proposition we obtain solutions of the hierarchy.

Theorem 6.5. *The map $\mathcal{C}_{\alpha,\lambda} \to \left(\mathrm{Mat}(d, \mathbb{C}) \otimes \mathcal{P}\right)^{d+1}$ which assigns to (X, Y, v_i, w_i) the elements L, R_α given by* (6.8), (6.20) *sends the Hamiltonian flows* (6.18), (6.19) *to the flows of the matrix hierarchy* (6.4), (6.5). *Therefore solutions of the hierarchy can be found by integrating the flows* (6.18), (6.19) *with an arbitrary initial point in $\mathcal{C}_{\alpha,\lambda}$.*

6.3. **Darboux coordinates and integrable dynamics.** For the full hierarchy, the solutions are parameterised by the varieties (3.17) for the quiver Q as in (3.14). As in Section 5.4, let us consider the Calogero–Moser space $\mathcal{C}_{\alpha,\lambda}$ for the special choice of the dimension vector $\alpha = n\delta$ where $\delta = (1,\dots,1)$. Let $\mathcal{C}_{n,\lambda}$ denote this space; the formula (6.15) the gives us that $\dim \mathcal{C}_{n,\lambda} = 2mnd$. The construction of Darboux coordinates on $\mathcal{C}_{n,\lambda}$ will be done entirely analogously to Section 5.4.

Consider a point of $\mathcal{C}_{n,\lambda}$ represented by a collection of linear maps $X_i, Y_j, v_{i,\alpha}$, $w_{i,\alpha}$, assuming the operator $X_{m-1}\dots X_1X_0 \in \mathrm{End}(V_0)$ has distinct non-zero eigenvalues $\nu_1^m,\dots,\nu_n^m$. Such points form a dense subset $\mathcal{C}'_{n,\lambda} \subset \mathcal{C}_{n,\lambda}$. As in the case $d = 1$, there exists bases in each of V_i diagonalizing the matrices X_i as follows:

$$X_i = \mathrm{diag}(\nu_1,\dots,\nu_n)\,. \tag{6.23}$$

Substituting this into the relations (6.12) we obtain the following formulas:

$$(Y_i)_{jj} = \mu_j + \frac{1}{\nu_j}\sum_{r=0}^{i}\big(\lambda_r + (\psi_j\varphi_j)_{rr}\big) + \frac{1}{\nu_j}\sum_{r=0}^{m-1}\frac{r-m}{m}\big(\lambda_r + (\psi_j\varphi_j)_{rr}\big), \tag{6.24}$$

$$(Y_i)_{jk} = -\sum_{l=0}^{m-1}\frac{(\psi_k\varphi_j)_{i-l,i-l}\,\nu_j^l\nu_k^{m-l-1}}{\nu_j^m - \nu_k^m} \qquad (j\neq k), \tag{6.25}$$

$$(v_{i,\alpha})_j = (\varphi_j)_{\alpha i}\,, \qquad (w_{i,\alpha})_j = (\psi_j)_{i\alpha} \qquad (\alpha = 1,\dots,d), \tag{6.26}$$

where $i = 0,\dots,m-1$, and φ_j and ψ_j are matrices of size $d\times m$ and $m\times d$, respectively, satisfying the constraint $\mathrm{tr}(\varphi_j\psi_j) = -|\lambda|$ $(j = 1,\dots,n)$. As above, with each pair (φ_j,ψ_j) we can associate a point q_j of the symplectic variety

$$Q_{m,d} = \big\{(\varphi,\psi)\in \mathrm{Hom}(\mathbb{C}^m,\mathbb{C}^d)\oplus\mathrm{Hom}(\mathbb{C}^d,\mathbb{C}^m)\mid \mathrm{tr}(\varphi\psi) = -|\lambda|\big\}/\mathbb{C}^\times,$$

where the group $\mathbb{C}^\times$ acts by $(\varphi,\psi)\mapsto(\kappa\varphi,\kappa^{-1}\psi)$. Thus we obtain a local parameterisation of $\mathcal{C}'_{n,\lambda}$ by $\{\nu_j,\mu_j,q_j\}$.

Again, in the case $j\neq k$ we can rewrite the formula as

$$(Y_i)_{jk} = \sum_{r\in I}\frac{\mu^{-ir}\mathrm{tr}\,(\varphi_j\,E^r\,\psi_k\,)}{m(\nu_k - \mu^r\nu_j)}\,, \qquad E^r = \mathrm{diag}(1,\mu^r,\mu^{2r},\dots,\mu^{(m-1)r}). \tag{6.27}$$

The symplectic structure (6.16) induces a symplectic structure on $\mathcal{C}_{n,\lambda}$, which we denote by $\omega_{\mathcal{C}_{n,\lambda}}$.

Proposition 6.6. *The coordinates $\nu_j,\mu_j,q_j = (\varphi_j,\psi_j)$ are local Darboux coordinates on $\mathcal{C}'_{n,\lambda}$, that is the symplectic form $\omega_{\mathcal{C}_{n,\lambda}}$ can be written as*

$$\omega_{\mathcal{C}_{n,\lambda}} = \sum_{j=1}^{n}\big(m\,\mathrm{d}\mu_j\wedge\mathrm{d}\nu_j + \mathrm{tr}(\mathrm{d}\psi_j\wedge\mathrm{d}\varphi_j)\big)\,, \tag{6.28}$$

where $\mathrm{tr}(\mathrm{d}\psi_j\wedge\mathrm{d}\varphi_j) = \sum\limits_{r=0}^{m-1}\sum\limits_{\beta=1}^{d}\mathrm{d}(\psi_j)_{r\beta}\wedge\mathrm{d}(\varphi_j)_{\beta r}$ *is understood as the corresponding form on $Q_{m,d}$.*

The derivation of (6.28) is completely analogous to the proof of Prop. 5.15.

Let us consider the variety $\mathfrak{h}_{reg}\times\mathfrak{h}^*\times(Q_{m,d})^n$ equipped with the symplectic form (6.28). Substituting (6.24)–(6.26) into the Hamiltonians $H_{k,\beta}$ we get Poisson commuting functions on this symplectic variety. As in the case $d = 1$ we obtain an integrable system in this way:

Proposition 6.7. *Let $H_{k,\beta} = H_{k,\beta}(\nu,\mu,q)$ be the functions of the variables $(\nu,\mu,q) \in \mathfrak{h}_{reg} \times \mathfrak{h}^* \times (Q_{m,d})^n$, obtained by substituting the formulas* (6.24)–(6.26) *into $H_{k,\beta} = -\sum_{i\in I} \mathrm{tr}(E_\beta w_i Y^k v_{i+k})$. Then $H_{k,\beta}$ with $k = 1,\dots,mn$ and $\beta = 1,\dots,d$ are functionally independent, Poisson commuting functions and hence define a completely integrable system. The Hamiltonian flows defined by $H_{k,\beta}$ extend from $\mathcal{C}'_{n,\lambda} = \mathfrak{h}_{reg} \times \mathfrak{h}^* \times (Q_{m,d})^n/(S_n \ltimes \Gamma^n)$ to produce complete flows on the Calogero–Moser space $\mathcal{C}_{n,\lambda} = \mathcal{C}_{n\delta,\lambda}$ for the quiver* (3.12).

Proof. The number of integrals is mnd. It is the half of the dimension of the phase space $\mathfrak{h}_{reg} \times \mathfrak{h}^* \times (Q_{m,d})^n$. Thus it suffices to show their independence.

Note that there is an isomorphism $\mathcal{C}_{n,\lambda} \to \mathcal{C}_{n,\lambda'}$, where $\lambda' = (-\lambda_{m-1},\dots,-\lambda_0)$, defined by

$$X_i \to Y_{-i-1}\,, \qquad Y_i \to X_{-i-1}\,, \qquad v_{i,\alpha} \to v_{-i,\alpha}\,, \qquad w_{i,\alpha} \to -w_{-i,\alpha}\,.$$

Under this isomorphism the Hamiltonians $H_{k,\beta}$ takes the form

$$\widetilde{H}_{k,\beta} = \sum_{i\in I} w_{i+k,\beta} X^k v_{i,\beta} = \sum_{i\in I}\sum_{j=1}^{n} (\varphi_j)_{\beta,i}(\psi_j)_{i+k,\beta}\nu_j^k\,.$$

Therefore, it is enough to proof the independence of the functions $\widetilde{H}_{k,\beta}$ in the neighbourhood of a point of $\mathfrak{h}_{reg} \times \mathfrak{h}^* \times (Q_{m,d})^n$.

Consider $\widetilde{H}_k := \sum\limits_{\beta=1}^{d} \widetilde{H}_{k,\beta}$ for $k = mp$, $p = 1,\dots,n$:

$$\widetilde{H}_{mp} = \sum_{j=1}^{n} \mathrm{tr}(\varphi_j\psi_j)\nu_j^{mp} = -|\lambda| \sum_{j=1}^{n} \nu_j^{mp}\,.$$

Since $\nu_i^m \neq \nu_j^m \neq 0$ for $i \neq j$ on $\mathfrak{h}_{reg}$, the variables $\nu_1,\dots,\nu_n$ can be expressed locally via $\widetilde{H}_{mp}$. Now let $k = mp - q$, where $p = 1,\dots,n$ and $q = 0,\dots,m-1$. Then

$$\widetilde{H}_{mp-q,\beta} = \sum_{j=1}^{n} z_{j,\beta,q}\nu_j^{mp-q}\,, \qquad \text{where} \quad z_{j,\beta,q} = \sum_{i\in I} (\varphi_j)_{\beta,i}(\psi_j)_{i-q,\beta}\,.$$

Fixing β and q we obtain a system of linear equations with a Vandermonde matrix. It follows that locally $z_{j,\beta,q}$ are functions of $\widetilde{H}_{k,\beta}$, $k \leqslant mn$. Thus it suffices to show that there are mnd independent functions on $\mathfrak{h}_{reg} \times \mathfrak{h}^* \times (Q_{m,d})^n$ among ν_j and $z_{j,\beta,q}$, $j = 1,\dots,n$, $\beta = 1,\dots,d$, $q = 0,\dots,m-1$.

For any fixed j, the functions $z_{j,\beta,0}$ satisfy the constraint $\sum_{\beta=1}^{d} z_{j,\beta,0} = -|\lambda|$. Clearly, we only need to prove that among $z_{j,\beta,q}$ with $\beta = 1,\dots,d$, $q = 0,\dots,m-1$ there exist $md-1$ functions which are independent as functions on $Q_{m,d}$.

Let us first consider $z_{j,\beta,q}$ as functions on a lager space $\widehat{Q}_{m,d} = \mathrm{Hom}(\mathbb{C}^m,\mathbb{C}^d) \oplus \mathrm{Hom}(\mathbb{C}^d,\mathbb{C}^m)$. Choose the point $P \in \widehat{Q}_{m,d}$ with the following coordinates:

$$(\varphi_j)_{\beta,i} = -|\lambda|/d\,, \qquad\qquad (\psi_j)_{i,\beta} = \delta_{i,0}\,.$$

Since $\dfrac{\partial z_{j,\beta,q}}{\partial(\varphi_j)_{\alpha,r}} = \delta_{\alpha\beta}\delta_{rq}$ at the point P, the differentials $dz_{j,\beta,q}$ ($\beta = 1,\dots,d$, $q = 0,\dots,m-1$) are linearly independent elements of $T_P^*\widehat{Q}_{m,d}$. Note that P belongs to the hypersurface $H \subset \widehat{Q}_{m,d}$ defined by the equation $\sum_{\beta=1}^{d} z_{j,\beta,0} = -|\lambda|$. Therefore, when restricted to T_PH, these differentials will span a subspace in T_P^*H

of dimension $(md-1)$. It is clear that the same will be true in a neighbourhood of P in H. This means that among $z_{j,\beta,q}$ there are $md-1$ elements which are independent as functions on H. It follows that they are also independent as functions on $Q_{m,d} = H/\mathbb{C}^\times$. □

It is convenient to consider the Hamiltonians

$$H_k := \sum_{\alpha=1}^{d} H_{k,\alpha} = -\sum_{i\in I} \mathrm{tr}(w_i Y^k v_{i+k})\,.$$

They are polynomials of the order k in the momentum variables μ_i. For $k = mp$ their leading terms are $H_{mp} = |\lambda| \sum_{j=1}^{n} \mu_j^{mp}$. Note that H_{mp} are functions of μ_j, ν_j and $(\psi_k\varphi_j)_{ii}$, where $i \in I$ and $j, k = 1, \dots, n$.

Example 6.8. In the case $m = 1$ the first two Hamiltonians have the form

$$H_1 = |\lambda| \sum_{i=1}^{n} \mu_i\,, \qquad H_2 = |\lambda| \sum_{i=1}^{n} \mu_i^2 + |\lambda| \sum_{i\neq j} \frac{(\psi_i\varphi_j)(\psi_j\varphi_i)}{(\nu_i-\nu_j)^2}\,. \tag{6.29}$$

This is the spin Calogero–Moser system from [GH]. Its relation with the matrix KP hierarchy and the spaces $\mathcal{C}_{n,\lambda}$ has been considered in [KBBT], [W2], [BeGeKa], [BP]. Note that even in the $m = 1$ case, our Theorem 6.5 gives a little bit more compared to [BeGeKa, Theorem 3.5], since we consider the full multicomponent KP hierarchy, while in [BeGeKa] only the flows corresponding to $\partial_{t_k} = \sum_{\beta=1}^{d} \partial_{t_{k,\beta}}$ are considered.

6.4. **Spherical case.** For the multicomponent hierarchy (6.4), (6.5) we can consider a sub-hierarchy consisting of the equations

$$\frac{\partial L}{\partial t_{mj,\beta}} = \big[(L^{mj}R_\beta)_+, L\big]\,, \qquad \frac{\partial R_\alpha}{\partial t_{mj,\beta}} = \big[(L^{mj}R_\beta)_+, R_\alpha\big] \tag{6.30}$$

($j \in \mathbb{N}_0$, $\beta = 1, \dots, d$) where the elements L and R_α are assumed to have the following symmetry

$$\epsilon_i L = L\epsilon_{i-1}\,, \qquad \epsilon_i R_\alpha = R_\alpha \epsilon_i\,. \tag{6.31}$$

These are analogous to the conditions (2.23), and we will call this the *multicomponent spherical sub-hierarchy*.

Once again, solutions of this sub-hierarchy will be constructed by using representations of quivers.

In Section 6.2 we constructed the Calogero–Moser space $\mathcal{C}_{\alpha,\lambda}$ associated with the quiver 3.12. Let us now consider the quiver (3.13) and write $\mathcal{C}^{sph}_{\alpha,\lambda}$ for the corresponding Calogero–Moser space. For simplicity, we restrict to the case $\ell = 0$, so we have d arrows $b_{0,1}, \dots, b_{0,d}$, all going from 0 to ∞. In this case the variety $\mathcal{C}^{sph}_{\alpha,\lambda}$ can be viewed as a symplectic subvariety of $\mathcal{C}_{\alpha,\lambda}$ by setting $v_i = w_i = 0$ $(i \neq 0)$ in the formulas (6.12)–(6.14). By Prop. 3.1

$$\dim \mathcal{C}^{sph}_{\alpha,\lambda} = 2d\alpha_0 - \sum_{i\in I} (\alpha_i - \alpha_{i+1})^2\,.$$

Now for $(X, Y, v_0, w_0) \in \mathcal{C}^{sph}_{\alpha,\lambda}$ consider the element

$$M = 1 - \epsilon_0 w_0 (X-x)^{-1}(Y-y)^{-1} v_0 \epsilon_0\,. \tag{6.32}$$

Since it commutes with each of ϵ_i, the operators

$$L = MyM^{-1}\,, \qquad\qquad R_\alpha = ME_\alpha M^{-1} \tag{6.33}$$

will have the symmetry (6.31).

Theorem 6.9. *Let X, Y, w_0 and v_0 satisfy the equations* (6.18), (6.19) *with $k = mj$ (where $v_i = w_i = 0$ for $i \neq 0$). Then the elements L, R_α given by* (6.32), (6.33) *satisfy the equations of the multicomponent spherical sub-hierarchy* (6.30). *Therefore solutions of the hierarchy can be found by integrating the flows* (6.18), (6.19) *with an arbitrary initial point in $\mathcal{C}^{sph}_{\alpha,\lambda}$.*

Proof. The flows (6.18), (6.19) preserve the subspace $\mathcal{C}^{sph}_{\alpha,\lambda} \subset \mathcal{C}_{\alpha,\lambda}$ defined by the conditions $v_i = 0$, $w_i = 0$ ($i \neq 0$). Therefore the proof reduces to the application of Prop. 6.4 in the case $k = mj$. □

The restriction of the flows (6.18), (6.19) with $k = mj$ onto $\mathcal{C}^{sph}_{\alpha,\lambda}$ is given by the Hamiltonians

$$h_{j,\beta} = H_{mj,\beta}\big|_{\mathcal{C}^{sph}_{\alpha,\lambda}} = -w_{0,\beta}Y^{mj}v_{0,\beta} \qquad\qquad (j \in \mathbb{N}_0,\ \beta = 1,\dots,d).$$

Consider the principal Hamiltonians $h_j := \sum_{\beta=1}^d h_{j,\beta}$. Note that $h_j = \frac{|\lambda|}{m}\mathrm{tr}Y^{mj} = |\lambda|\mathrm{tr}\widehat{Y}^j$, where $\widehat{Y} = Y_0Y_1\cdots Y_{m-1}$.

Let us now consider the special case $\alpha_0 = \alpha_1 = \ldots = \alpha_{m-1} = n$, writing $\mathcal{C}^{sph}_{n,\lambda}$ for $\mathcal{C}^{sph}_{n\delta,\lambda}$. This is a $2nd$-dimensional symplectic variety with coordinates $\{\nu_j, \mu_j, q_j\}$, where $q_j = (\varphi_j, \psi_j) \in Q_{1,d}$ with

$$Q_{1,d} = \big\{(\varphi,\psi) \in (\mathbb{C}^d) \oplus (\mathbb{C}^d)^* \mid \mathrm{tr}(\varphi\psi) = \psi\varphi = -|\lambda|\big\}/\mathbb{C}^\times\,, \quad \dim Q_{1,d} = 2d-2\,.$$

A generic point of $\mathcal{C}^{sph}_{n,\lambda}$ in these coordinates is described by the formulas

$$(X_i)_{jk} = \nu_j\delta_{jk}\,, \tag{6.34}$$

$$(Y_i)_{jj} = \mu_j + \frac{1}{\nu_j}\Big(\sum_{r=0}^{i}\lambda_r - \sum_{r=0}^{m-1}\frac{m-r}{m}\lambda_r\Big)\,, \tag{6.35}$$

$$(Y_i)_{jk} = -\frac{\nu_j^i\nu_k^{m-i-1}}{\nu_j^m - \nu_k^m}\psi_k\varphi_j\,, \qquad\qquad (j \neq k), \tag{6.36}$$

$$(v_{0\alpha})_j = (\varphi_j)_\alpha\,, \qquad\qquad (w_{0\alpha})_j = (\psi_j)_\alpha\,, \tag{6.37}$$

where $i = 0,\dots,m-1$. A calculation similar to the proof of Prop. 5.15 shows that the symplectic form on $\mathcal{C}^{sph}_{\alpha,\lambda}$ looks as $\omega_{sph} = \sum_{j=1}^n \big(m\mathrm{d}\mu_j \wedge \mathrm{d}\nu_j + \mathrm{d}\psi_j \wedge \mathrm{d}\varphi_j\big)$. By substituting the formulas (6.34)–(6.37) into the above $h_{j,\beta}$ we obtain Poisson commuting functions $h_{j,\beta}(\nu,\mu,q)$ on $\mathfrak{h}_{reg} \times \mathfrak{h}^* \times (Q_{1,d})^n$. By repeating the proof of Prop. 6.7 with $q = 0$ one proves that $h_{j,\beta}$ with $j = 1,\dots,n$ and $\beta = 1,\dots,d$ are functionally independent. Thereby we obtain the analogous result:

Proposition 6.10. *The functions $h_{j,\beta}(\nu,\mu,q)$ define a completely integrable system on $\mathfrak{h}_{reg} \times \mathfrak{h}^* \times (Q_{1,d})^n$. The Hamiltonian flows defined by $h_{j,\beta}$ extend from $\mathfrak{h}_{reg} \times \mathfrak{h}^* \times (Q_{1,d})^n/(S_n \ltimes \Gamma^n)$ to produce complete flows on $\mathcal{C}^{sph}_{n,\lambda}$.*

Example 6.11. Consider the case $m = 2$. The Hamiltonians $h_{p,\beta}$ describe a systems of n particles with coordinates ν_j momenta μ_j and spin variables $\varphi_j =$

$(\varphi_{j1},\dots,\varphi_{jd})^\top$ and $\psi_j=(\psi_{j1},\dots,\psi_{jd})$ satisfying $\psi_j\phi_j=-|\lambda|$. The first principal Hamiltonian of the system has the form

$$h_1=|\lambda|\sum_{i=1}^n\mu_i^2-\frac{|\lambda|\lambda_1^2}{4}\sum_{i=1}^n\frac{1}{\nu_i^2}-\frac{|\lambda|}{2}\sum_{i<j}\Big(\frac{1}{(\nu_i-\nu_j)^2}+\frac{1}{(\nu_i+\nu_j)^2}\Big)(\psi_i\varphi_j)(\psi_j\varphi_i)\,.$$

This is a B_n version of the Gibbons–Hermsen Hamiltonian (6.29), cf. [LX].

7. Further directions and links

Our results raise a number of questions; below we mention some of them and indicate further connections.

7.1. There are many aspects of the integrability for the usual KP hierarchy: τ-function formalism, W-symmetries, (bi-)Hamiltonian approach, free-field realisation, and so on. Therefore it is a natural problem to find analogous notions for our hierarchy and to interpret the constructed solutions from that point of view.

7.2. For special values of m the Calogero–Moser system for $G=\mathbb{Z}_m\wr S_n$ admits natural trigonometric and elliptic versions. In such cases, we expect these systems to be related to certain generalisations of the KP hierarchy. There is also a natural q-analogue of this story related to multiplicative preprojective algebras of Crawley-Boevey and Shaw [CBS]. These questions will be a subject of future work.

7.3. There is a link between the Calogero–Moser spaces for the cyclic quiver and the families of bispectral differential operators of Bessel type from [DG], [BHY]. The key to that link is the fact that $\epsilon_\ell y^m\epsilon_\ell$ can be interpreted as a generalised Bessel operator (the classical Bessel operator corresponds to $m=2$). Then one can use the operator (4.36) as a dressing, and construct bispectral differential operators in the form $\epsilon_\ell Mp(y^m)M^{-1}\epsilon_\ell$ for suitable polynomials p. The details will appear elsewhere.

Note that M. Rothstein suggested in [R] a description of bispectral operators of Bessel type in terms of Wilson's Calogero–Moser spaces $\mathcal{C}_n$. It is likely that his formulas describe some part of our Calogero–Moser space $\mathcal{C}_{n,\lambda}$, but it is difficult to see this directly because the formulas in [R] are rather cumbersome. Also, the link with the Calogero–Moser problem for $\mathbb{Z}_m\wr S_n$ was not observed there.

7.4. Our results can be used to prove a conjecture of Etingof and Rains. Namely, in [ER] the authors study algebraically integrable operators with $\mathbb{Z}_m$-symmetry. For the case of rational coefficients they conjecture that the poles of such operators should be equilibrium points of the Calogero–Moser system for $\mathbb{Z}_m\wr S_n$ (see [ER, Conjecture 4.10]). This is related to our results as follows. Let $\mathcal{C}_{n,\lambda}$ be Calogero–Moser space for the quiver (3.15) with $\ell=0$ and let $(X,Y,v_0,w_0)\in\mathcal{C}_{n,\lambda}$ be an equilibrium point for the Hamiltonian H_m. Then we have $\partial_{t_m}M=0$, where M is (4.36), implying $(L^m)_-=0$. Thus $D=\epsilon_0L^m\epsilon_0$ gives a purely differential operator. One has to restrict to the case $k_i\in\mathbb{Z}\tau$ to ensure that the operator D is algebraically integrable. Let us assume that the matrix X has distinct non-zero eigenvalues $\{\mu^r x_j\}$, $j=1,\dots,n$, $r=0,\dots,m-1$, and so $(x_1,\dots,x_n)\in\mathbb{C}^n$ is an equilibrium point of the Calogero–Moser problem for $\mathbb{Z}_m\wr S_n$ by our assumption about (X,Y,v_0,w_0). One can check that the resulting operator D satisfies all the assumptions of [ER, Conjecture 4.10]. This way we construct an algebraically integrable operator with $\mathbb{Z}_m$-symmetry starting from any equilibrium point of the

Calogero-Moser problem. The full proof of the conjecture requires showing that the above construction produces all such operators. We will return to this problem elsewhere.

7.5. In the case $m = 1$ the Calogero–Moser spaces $\mathcal{C}_n$ are known to be related to the Bethe algebra of the quantum Gaudin model, see [MTV]. It would therefore be interesting to relate the Calogero–Moser spaces $\mathcal{C}_{n,\lambda}$ with some generalisation of the Gaudin model. Note that a cyclotomic version of the Gaudin model has been proposed recently in [VY].

7.6. Finally, it would be interesting to understand which of our results can be generalised to other quivers (see in particular Remark 4.8 above).

References

[AMM] Airault, H., McKean, H. P., Moser, J.: *Rational and elliptic solutions of the Korteweg–de Vries equation and a related many-body problem*. Comm. Pure Appl. Math. **30**, no. 1, 95–148, (1977).

[AVdBVO] Asensio, M. J., Van den Bergh, M., Van Ostaeyen, F.: *A new algebraic approach to microlocalization of filtered rings*, Trans. AMS **316**, no. 2, 537–553, (1989).

[BHY] Bakalov, B., Horozov, E., Yakimov, M.: *Bispectral algebras of commuting ordinary differential operators.* Comm. Math. Phys. **190**, no. 2, 331–373, (1997); arXiv:q-alg/9602011

[BGK1] Baranovsky, V., Ginzburg, V., Kuznetsov, A.: *Quiver varieties and a noncommutative* $\mathbb{P}^2$. Compositio Math. **134**, no. 3, 283–318, (2002); arXiv:math/0103068 [math.AG].

[BGK2] Baranovsky, V., Ginzburg, V., Kuznetsov, A.: *Wilson's Grassmannian and a noncommutative quadric.* IMRN **21**, 1155–1197, (2003); arXiv:math/0203116 [math.AG].

[BeGeKa] Bergvelt, M., Gekhtman, M., Kasman, A.: *Spin Calogero particles and bispectral solutions of the matrix KP hierarchy.* Math. Phys. Anal. Geom. **12**, no. 2, 181–200, (2009).

[BW1] Berest, Yu., Wilson, G.: *Automorphisms and ideals of the Weyl algebra.* Math. Ann. 318, no. 1, 127–147, (2000); arXiv:math/0102190 [math.QA].

[BW2] Berest, Yu., Wilson, G.: *Ideal classes of the Weyl algebra and noncommutative projective geometry.* (With an appendix by Michel Van den Bergh). IMRN 26, 1347–1396, (2002); arXiv:math/0104248 [math.AG].

[BCS] Bordner, A. J., Corrigan, E., Sasaki, Ryu: *Calogero-Moser models. I. A new formulation.* Progr. Theoret. Phys. 100, no. 6, 1107–1129, (1998); arXiv:hep-th/9805106.

[BST] Bordner, A. J., Sasaki, R., Takasaki, K.: *Calogero-Moser models. II. Symmetries and foldings.* Progr. Theoret. Phys. **101**, no. 3, 487–518, (1999).

[BC] Berest, Yu., Chalykh, O.: *A_∞-modules and Calogero–Moser spaces.* J. Reine Angew. Math. **607**, 69–112, (2007); arXiv:math/0410194 [math.QA].

[BCE] Berest, Yu., Chalykh, O., Eshmatov, F.: *Recollement of deformed preprojective algebras and the Calogero-Moser correspondence.* Mosc. Math. J. **8**, no. 1, 21–37, 183, (2008); arXiv:0706.3006 [math.RT].

[BP] Bielawski, R., Pidstrygach, V.: *On the symplectic structure of instanton moduli spaces.* Adv. Math. **226**, no. 3, 2796–2824, (2011); arXiv:0812.4918 [math.SG].

[BLB] Bocklandt, R., Le Bruyn, L.: *Necklace Lie algebras and noncommutative symplectic geometry.* Math. Z. **240**, no. 1, 141–167, (2002); arXiv:math/0010030 [math.AG].

[CC] Chudnovsky, D. V., Chudnovsky, G. V.: *Pole expansions of nonlinear partial differential equations.* 11 Nuovo Cimento, **40B**, no. 2, 339–353, (1977).

[CBH] Crawley-Boevey, W., Holland, M.: *Noncommutative deformations of Kleinian singularities*, Duke Math. J. **92** (3), 605–635, (1998).

[CB1] Crawley-Boevey, W.: *Representations of quivers, preprojective algebras and deformations of quotient singularities*, lectures at the Workshop on "Quantizations of Kleinian singularities", Oberwolfach, May 1999. Available at: http://www1.maths.leeds.ac.uk/ pmtwc/dmvlecs.pdf.

[CB2] Crawley-Boevey, W.: *Geometry of the moment map for representations of quivers.* Compositio Math. **126**, no. 3, 257–293, (2001).

[CB3] Crawley-Boevey, W.: *Decomposition of Marsden-Weinstein reductions for representations of quivers.* Compositio Math. **130**, no. 2, 225–239, (2002); arXiv:math/0007191 [math.AG].

[CB4] Crawley-Boevey, W.: *Poisson structures on moduli spaces of representations.* J. Algebra **325**, 205–215, (2011).

[CBS] Crawley-Boevey, W., Shaw, P.: *Multiplicative preprojective algebras, middle convolution and the Deligne-Simpson problem.* Adv. Math. **201**, no. 1, 180–208, (2006); arXiv:math/0404186 [math.RA].

[DJKM] Date, E., Jimbo, M., Kashiwara, M., Miwa, T.: *Transformation groups for soliton equations. IV. A new hierarchy of soliton equations of KP-type.* Phys. D **4**, no. 3, 343–365, (1982).

[Di] Dickey, L.: *Soliton equations and Hamiltonian Systems.* Advanced Series of Mathematical Physics, vol. 26, 2003 (second edition).

[DG] Duistermaat, J. J., Grünbaum, F. A., *Differential equations in the spectral parameter.* Comm. Math. Phys. **103**, no. 2, 177–240, (1986).

[D] Dunkl, C. F.: *Differential-difference operators associated to reflection groups*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. **311** (1989), 167–183.

[DO] Dunkl, C. F., Opdam, E. M.: *Dunkl operators for complex reflection groups*, Proc. London Math. Soc. (3) **86** (1), 70–108, (2003); arXiv:math/0108185 [math.RT].

[Esh] Eshmatov, F.: *DG-models of projective modules and Nakajima quiver varieties.* Homology, Homotopy Appl. **9**, no. 2, 177–208, (2007); arXiv:math/0604011 [math.QA].

[EG] Etingof, P., Ginzburg, V.: *Symplectic reflection algebras, Calogero–Moser space, and deformed Harish-Chandra homomorphism*, Invent. Math. **147** (2), 243–348, (2002); arXiv:math/0011114 [math.AG].

[EGGO] Etingof, P., Gan, W. L., Ginzburg, V., Oblomkov, A.: *Harish-Chandra homomorphisms and symplectic reflection algebras for wreath-products*, Publ. Math. Inst. Hautes Études Sci. **105**, 91–155, (2007); arXiv:math/0511489 [math.RT].

[Et] Etingof, P.: *Calogero–Moser systems and representation theory.* Zurich lectures in advanced mathematics, EMS, (2007).

[EM] Etingof, P., Ma, X.: *Lecture notes on Cherednik algebras.* arXiv:1001.0432 [math.RT], (2010).

[EFMV] Etingof, P., Felder, G., Ma, X., Veselov, A.: *On elliptic Calogero–Moser systems for complex crystallographic reflection groups*, J. Algebra **329**, 107–129, (2011); arXiv:1003.4689 [math.QA].

[ER] Etingof, P., Rains, E.: *On algebraically integrable differential operators on an elliptic curve.* SIGMA (Symmetry Integrability Geom. Methods Appl.) **7**, Paper 062, 19 pp, (2011); arXiv:1011.6410 [math-ph].

[GH] Gibbons, J., Hermsen, T.: *A generalisation of the Calogero–Moser system*, Physica **11D**, 337–348, (1984).

[He] Heckman, G. J.: *A remark on the Dunkl differential-difference operators*, Harmonic Analysis on Reductive Groups, 181–191, (1989); Progr. Math., **101**, Birkhäuser Boston, (1991).

[Ho] Hodges, T. J.: *Noncommutative deformations of type–A Kleinian singularities*, J. Algebra **161**, 271–290, (1993).

[Kac] Kac, V. G.: *Infinite root systems, representations of graphs and invariant theory*, Invent. Math. **56**, 57–92, (1980).

[KKO] Kapustin, A., Kuznetsov, A., Orlov, D.: *Noncommutative instantons and twistor transform.* Comm. Math. Phys. **221**, no. 2, 385–432, (2001); arXiv:hep-th/0002193.

[Kr] Krichever, I. M.: *On rational solutions of the Kadomtsev–Petviashvili equation and integrable systems of N particles on the line.* Funct. Anal. Appl. **12**:1, 76–78 (Russian), 59–61 (English), (1978).

[KBBT] Krichever, I. M., Babelon, O., Billey, E., Talon, M.: *Spin generalization of the Calogero-Moser system and the matrix KP equation.* Topics in topology and mathematical physics, 83–119; Amer. Math. Soc. Transl. Ser. **2**, 170, (1995); arXiv:hep-th/9411160.

[LX] Li, L. C., Xu, P.: *A class of integrable spin Calogero–Moser systems.* Comm. Math. Phys. **231**, no. 2, 257–286, (2002).

[MW] Marsden, J., Weinstein, A.: *Reduction of symplectic manifolds with symmetry.* Rep. Mathematical Phys. **5**, no. 1, 121–130, (1974).

[M] Martino, M.: *Stratification of Marsden–Weinstein reductions for representations of quivers and deformations of symplectic quotient singularities*, Math. Z. **258**, no. 1, 1–28, (2008); arXiv:math/0603562 [math.RT]. `Add the reference!`

[MTV] Mukhin, E., Tarasov, V., Varchenko, A.: *Bethe algebra of Gaudin model, Calogero-Moser space, and Cherednik algebra.* IMRN **5**, 1174–1204, (2014); arXiv:0906.5185 [math.QA].

[OT] Olive, D., Turok, N., *The symmetries of Dynkin diagrams and the reduction of Toda field equations.* Nuclear Phys. B **215**, no. 4, 470–494, (1983).

[OP1] Olshanetsky, M. A., Perelomov, A. M.: *Completely integrable Hamiltonian systems connected with semisimple Lie algebras.* Invent. Math. **37**, no. 2, 93–108, (1976).

[OP2] Olshanetsky, M. A., Perelomov, A. M.: *Classical integrable finite-dimensional systems related to Lie algebras.* Phys. Rep. **71**, no. 5, 313–400, (1981).

[R] Rothstein, M.: *Explicit formulas for the Airy and Bessel bispectral involutions in terms of Calogero–Moser pairs.* The bispectral problem, 105–110, CRM Proc. Lecture Notes **14**, (1998); arXiv:q-alg/9611027.

[Sa] Sato, M.: *Soliton equations as dynamical systems on an infinite dimensional Grassmann manifold.* RISM Kôkyûroku **439**, 30–46, (1981).

[ST] Shephard, G. C., Todd, J. A.: *Finite unitary reflection groups*, Canad. J. Math. **6**, 274–304, (1954).

[VdB] Van den Bergh, M.: *Double Poisson algebras.* Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. **360**, no. 11, 5711–5769 (2008); arXiv:math/0410528 [math.QA].

[VY] Vicedo, B., Young, C. A. S.: *Cyclotomic Gaudin models: construction and Bethe ansatz*, arXiv:1409.6937 [math.QA].

[W1] Wilson, G.: *Collisions of Calogero–Moser particles and an adelic Grassmannian.* (With an appendix by I. G. Macdonald). Invent. Math. **133**, no. 1, 1–41, (1998).

[W2] Wilson, G.: *Notes on the vector adelic Grassmannian*, arXiv:1507.00693 [math.SG], (2009).

School of Mathematics, University of Leeds, Leeds LS2 9JT, UK
E-mail address: o.chalykh@leeds.ac.uk

School of Mathematics, University of Leeds, Leeds LS2 9JT, UK
E-mail address: aleksejsilantjev@gmail.com